arXiv:math/0510217v2 [math.NT] 14 Nov 2005

Null Polynomials modulo m

Shujun Li
`http://www.hooklee.com`

February 2, 2008

Abstract

This paper studies so-called "null polynomials modulo m", i.e., polynomials with integer coefficients[1] that satisfy $f(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{m}$ for any integer x. The study on null polynomials is helpful to reduce congruences of higher degrees modulo m and to enumerate equivalent polynomial functions modulo m, i.e., functions over $\mathbb{Z}_m = \{0, \cdots, m-1\}$ generated by integer polynomials. The most well-known null polynomial is $f(x) = x^p - x$ modulo a prime p.

After pointing out that null polynomials modulo a composite can be studied by handling null polynomials modulo each prime power, this paper mainly focuses on null polynomials modulo p^d ($d \geq 1$). A typical monic null polynomial of the least degree modulo p^d is given for any value of $d \geq 1$, from which one can further enumerate all null polynomials modulo p^d. The most useful result obtained in this paper are Theorem 32 in Sec. 4.4 and its derivative – Theorem 34 in Sec. 4.5. The results given in Sec. 4.3 form a basis of the induction proofs given in Sec. 4.4. However, if you do not care how the proofs in Sec. 4.4 were established, you can simply skip Sec. 4.3. Theorems 28 and 31 are very important for the proof of Theorem 32 and should be paid more attention.

Note: After finishing this draft, we noticed that some results given in this paper have been covered in Kempner's papers [3,4]. Since we use a different way to obtain the results, this work can be considered as an independent and different proof. For a brief introduction to Kempner's proof, see the Appendix of this paper.

Contents

1 Introduction 2

2 Preliminaries 3
- 2.1 Some Simple Lemmas on Congruences . . . 3
- 2.2 Polynomial Congruences Modulo m . . . 3
- 2.3 Polynomial Functions Modulo m . . . 4
- 2.4 Equivalent Polynomials Modulo m . . . 4
- 2.5 Null Polynomials modulo m . . . 5

3 Null Polynomial modulo $m = \prod_{i=1}^{r} p_i^{d_i}$ 5

4 Null Polynomials modulo p^d ($d \geq 1$) 6
- 4.1 Null Polynomials modulo p . . . 6
- 4.2 Null Polynomials modulo p^d ($d \geq 1$): Some Trivial Results . . . 7
- 4.3 Null Polynomials modulo p^d: The Case of $2 \leq d \leq p(p+1)+1$ . . . 8
  - 4.3.1 The Case of $2 \leq d \leq p$ . . . 9
  - 4.3.2 The Case of $d = p+1$ . . . 10
  - 4.3.3 The Case of $p+2 \leq d \leq 2p+1$ . . . 12
  - 4.3.4 The Case of $d = 2p+2$ . . . 13
  - 4.3.5 The Case of $1 \leq d \leq p(p+1)$ . . . 13
  - 4.3.6 The Case of $d = p(p+1)+1$ . . . 14
- 4.4 The General Case: Null Polynomials modulo p^d ($d \geq 1$) . . . 15

---

[1] In this paper, we always call them "integer polynomial" in short. Note that sometime another name "integral polynomial" is used [1, Sec. 7.2]. However, we prefer to "integer polynomial" to avoid confusion with the word "integral" as an adjective (see [2]).

4.4.1 Some Definitions and Preliminaries 15
4.4.2 Main Results 19
4.5 Enumerating All Null Polynomials modulo p^d $(d \geq 1)$ 20

1 Introduction

In this paper, we study integer polynomials that satisfy $f(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{m}$ for any integer x. We call such polynomials "null polynomials modulo m", due to the fact that they generate nothing meaningful modulo p^d. Till now, I have not found an existing name of such polynomials. If you know one, please let me know and recommend a paper or book for reference. Thanks in advance for your help.

When p is a prime, there is a most well-known null polynomial modulo p: $f(x) = x^p - x$. However, actually it is not the simplest one, since one should use the Fermat's little theorem to derive that it is a null polynomial modulo p. In my opinion, $\forall m \in \mathbb{Z}$, the most simplest null polynomial modulo m is $f(x) = \prod_{i=0}^{m-1}(x-i)$. When p is a prime, we have $\prod_{i=0}^{p-1}(x-i) \equiv x^p - x \pmod{p}$ [1, Theorem 112], where "$\equiv$" means that the coefficients of the two polynomials are congruent modulo p. However, when m is not a prime, $f(x) = \prod_{i=0}^{m-1}(x-i)$ is generally not a null polynomial of the least degree modulo m. For example, when $m = p^d$ $(d \geq 2)$, it is obvious that $f(x) = p^{d-1}(x^p - x)$ is a null polynomial of degree p modulo p^d and $f(x) = (x^p - x)^d$ is a **monic** null polynomial of degree pd modulo p^d. Then, we have a question: can we find the least degree of all (monic) null polynomials modulo any integer m? This paper gives an affirmative answer to this question (Theorems 32 and 33). In addition, it is found that one can enumerate[2] all null polynomials modulo m (see theorems in Sec. 4.5, especially Theorem 34).

The most natural application of a monic null polynomial $f(x)$ modulo m is on the reduction of high-degree congruences modulo m. The null polynomial $f(x) = x^p - x$ has been widely used to reduce congruences of degrees $> p$ modulo p before solving them [1, 5–9]. Another application of the study on null polynomials modulo m is to distinguish and enumerate equivalent polynomials modulo m, i.e., the integer polynomials that induce the same "polynomial functions modulo m" [10][3]. This is based on a simple theorem (Theorem 35): *two integer polynomials* $f_1(x)$ *and* $f_2(x)$ *are equivalent modulo* m *if and only if* $f_1(x) - f_2(x)$ *is a null polynomial modulo* m. In fact, this research on null polynomials modulo m was stirred by a pervious study on enumerating all distinct permutations modulo m induced from "permutation polynomials modulo m" [12][4]. The results obtained in this paper can be used to get an exact estimation of the number of distinct permutations modulo p^d induced from polynomials of degree $n \geq 2p - 1$ modulo p^d. More details on the applications of null polynomials for enumerating permutation polynomials modulo p^d will be given later in a revised version of [arXiv:math.NT/0509523, 2005]. In addition, we believe that the study on null polynomials modulo p^d is useful to reveal some subtle features of the complete systems of polynomial residues modulo a prime and its powers.

It is well-known that permutation polynomials modulo m can be used in cryptography and coding [17–21]. Apparently, null polynomials modulo m can serve as a tool to analyze the security and performance of the designed ciphers or coding schemes based on permutation polynomials modulo m. For example, the least degree of all null polynomials modulo m gives an upper bound of the number of all coefficients of the permutation polynomials used in cryptography and coding. As shown in Theorem 33 of this paper, when $m = p^d$, the least degree is generally much less than p^d, which means that one has to be more careful when using permutation polynomials to design cryptosystems.

This paper is organized as follow. Section 2 gives some preliminary definitions and lemmas, as preparations for future discussions. In Sec. 3, we point out that null polynomials modulo a composite m can be studied via null polynomials modulo each prime power of m. The main body of this paper is Sec. 4, in which we discuss null polynomials modulo a prime and prime powers. In Sec. 4.1, null polynomials modulo p is studied and it is pointed out that $f(x) = x^p - x$ is the only monic null polynomial of degree p modulo p. In Sec. 4.2, some trivial results on null polynomials modulo p^d $(d \geq 1)$ are given. Then, when $2 \leq d \leq p(p+1)+1$, null polynomials modulo p^d are carefully studied in Sec. 4.3, which forms a basis of the general results for $d \geq 1$ given in Sec. 4.4. In Sec. 4.5, it is studied how to enumerate all null polynomials modulo p^d, based on the results given in Sec. 4.4.

---

[2] In this paper, the word "enumerate" means to list all null polynomials modulo m, not only to get the number of all null polynomials modulo m. It is obvious that the former is much more strong than the latter.

[3] In the algebra literature, there exist "polynomial functions of the finite filed $\mathbb{F}_q$" [11]. Note that when q is not a prime, "polynomial functions modulo q" and "polynomial functions of $\mathbb{F}_q$" are conceptually different, since $(\mathbb{Z}_q, +, \cdot)$ is just a ring, not a finite field.

[4] Similarly, in the algebra literature, there exist "permutation polynomials of the finite filed $\mathbb{F}_q$" [13–16]. As mentioned in previous footnote, when q is a prime power, "permutation polynomial modulo q" and "permutation polynomials of $\mathbb{F}_q$" are conceptually different.

2 Preliminaries

This section lists a number of definitions and notations used throughout in this paper. Some preliminary lemmas are also given to simplify the discussions in this paper. I try to keep the definitions, notations and lemmas as simple as possible. Please feel free to contact me if you have some ideas of making them simpler, more elegant, more beautiful, and/or more rigorous in mathematics.

2.1 Some Simple Lemmas on Congruences

The three lemmas will be used in this paper without explicit citations.

Lemma 1 (Theorem 2.2 in [5]) *Assume $f(x)$ is an integer polynomial. If $x_1 \equiv x_2 \pmod{m}$, then $f(x_1) \equiv f(x_2) \pmod{m}$.*

Lemma 2 *If $a \equiv 0 \pmod{m_1}$ and $b \equiv 0 \pmod{m_2}$, then $ab \equiv 0 \pmod{m_1 m_2}$.*

Proof: From $a \equiv 0 \pmod{m_1}$ and $b \equiv 0 \pmod{m_2}$, there exist $k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $a = k_1 m_1$ and $b = k_2 m_2$. So, $ab = k_1 k_2 m_1 m_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{m_1 m_2}$. ■

The most frequently used form of the above lemma is as follows: if $f_1(x)$ and $f_2(x)$ are null polynomials modulo p^{d_1} and p^{d_2}, respectively, then $f_1(x) f_2(x)$ is a null polynomial modulo $p^{d_1 d_2}$. See Sec. 2.5 for the formal definition of "null polynomials modulo m".

Lemma 3 *Assume $\boldsymbol{A}$ is an $n \times n$ matrix, $\boldsymbol{X}$ is a vector of n unknown integers, and $\boldsymbol{B}$ is a vector of n integers. If $|\boldsymbol{A}|$ is relatively prime to m, i.e., $\gcd(|\boldsymbol{A}|, m) = 1$, then $\boldsymbol{AX} \equiv \boldsymbol{B} \pmod{m}$ has a unique set of incongruent solutions $\boldsymbol{X} \equiv \overline{\Delta}(\mathrm{adj}(\boldsymbol{A}))\boldsymbol{B} \pmod{m}$, where $\overline{\Delta}$ is an inverse of $\Delta = |\boldsymbol{A}|$ modulo m and $\mathrm{adj}(\boldsymbol{A})$ is the adjoint of $\boldsymbol{A}$.*

Proof: This lemma is a direct result of Theorem 3.18 in [7] (see pages 151 and 152). ■

2.2 Polynomial Congruences Modulo m

The following definition is from Chap. VII of [1] and related concepts are slightly extended.

Definition 1 *Given two integer polynomials of degree n: $f(x) = a_n x^n + \cdots + a_1 x + a_0$ and $g(x) = b_n x^n + \cdots + b_1 x + b_0$, if $\forall i = 0 \sim n$, $a_i \equiv b_i \pmod{m}$, we say $\underline{f(x) \text{ is congruent to } g(x) \text{ modulo } m}$, or $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ are $\underline{\text{congruent (polynomials) modulo } m}$, which is denoted by $f(x) \equiv g(x) \pmod{m}$. On the other hand, if $\exists i \in \{1, \cdots, n\}$, such that $a_i \not\equiv b_i \pmod{m}$, we say $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ are $\underline{\text{incongruent (polynomials) modulo } m}$, denoted by $f(x) \not\equiv g(x) \pmod{m}$.*

Definition 2 *A $\underline{\text{polynomial congruence (residue) class modulo } m}$ is a set of all polynomials congruent to each other modulo m.*

Definition 3 *A set of polynomials of degree n modulo m is a $\underline{\text{complete system of polynomial residues of degree } n \text{ modulo } m}$, if for every polynomial of degree n modulo m there is one and only one congruent polynomial in this set.*

Lemma 4 *The following set of polynomials is a complete system of polynomial residues of degree n modulo m:*

$$\mathbb{F}[x] = \{f(x) = a_n x^n + \cdots + a_1 x + a_0 \,| a_n \in \{1, \cdots, m-1\}, a_{n-1}, \cdots, a_0 \in \{0, \cdots, m-1\}\}.$$

Proof: Assume $f(x) = a_n x^n + \cdots + a_1 x + a_0$ is a polynomial of degree n modulo m. Choose $a_i^* = (a_i \bmod m) \in \{0, \cdots, m-1\}$ $(i = 0 \sim n)$, then $f^*(x) = a_n^* x^n + \cdots + a_1^* x + a_0^* \in \mathbb{F}$ is congruent to $f(x)$. Assume that another polynomial $g(x) = b_n x^n + \cdots + b_1 x + b_0 \in \mathbb{F}$ is also congruent to $f(x)$. Then, $\forall i = 0 \sim n$, $b_i \equiv a_i^* \pmod{m}$. Since $\{0, \cdots, m-1\}$ is a complete set of residues modulo m, $b_i = a_i^*$. This means that $g(x) = f^*(x)$. This completes the proof of this lemma. ■

Definition 4 *A set of polynomials of degree $\leq n$ modulo m is a $\underline{\text{complete system of polynomial residues of degree } \leq n \text{ modulo } m}$, if for every polynomial of degree $\leq n$ modulo m there is one and only one congruence polynomial.*

Lemma 5 *The following set of polynomials is a complete system of polynomial residues of degree n modulo m:*

$$\mathbb{F}[x] = \{f(x) = a_n x^n + \cdots + a_1 x + a_0 \,| a_n, a_{n-1}, \cdots, a_0 \in \{0, \cdots, m-1\}\}.$$

Proof: The proof is similar to the above lemma. ■

2.3 Polynomial Functions Modulo m

Definition 5 *If a function over $\{0, \cdots, m-1\}$ can be represented by a polynomial modulo m, we say this function is polynomial modulo m.*

Lemma 6 *Assume p is a prime. Then, any function over $\{0, \cdots, p-1\}$ is polynomial modulo p.*

Proof: Assume $f(x) = a_n x^n + \cdots + a_1 x + a_0$ is a polynomial of degree $n \geq p-1$ modulo p. Given a function $F: \{0, \cdots, p-1\} \to \{0, \cdots, p-1\}$, one has the following system of congruences:

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0^2 & \cdots & 0^{p-1} \\ 1 & 1 & 1^2 & \cdots & 1^{p-1} \\ 1 & 2 & 2^2 & \cdots & 2^{p-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & p-1 & (p-1)^2 & \cdots & (p-1)^{p-1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} a_0 \\ a_1 \\ a_2 \\ \vdots \\ a_{p-1} \end{bmatrix} \equiv \begin{bmatrix} F(0) \\ F(1) - \sum_{i=p}^{n} a_i \\ F(2) - \sum_{i=p}^{n} 2^i a_i \\ \vdots \\ F(p-1) - \sum_{i=p}^{n} (p-1)^i a_i \end{bmatrix} \pmod{p^d}.$$

Since the matrix at the left side is a Vondermonde matrix, one can see its determinant is relatively prime to p. So, for each combination of $a_p, \cdots, a_n$, there is a unique set of incongruent solutions of $a_0, \cdots, a_{p-1}$. Thus this lemma is proved. ■

2.4 Equivalent Polynomials Modulo m

The concept of equivalent polynomial modulo m is used to describe incongruent but equivalent (for any integer) polynomials modulo m.

Definition 6 *Two integer polynomials $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ are equivalent (polynomials) modulo m if $\forall x \in \mathbb{Z}$, $f(x) \equiv g(x) \pmod{m}$. In other words, two polynomials are equivalent modulo m if they derive the same polynomial function modulo m.*

Note that two equivalent polynomials modulo m may not be congruent modulo p, and may have distinct degrees. As a typical example, when p is a prime, $f(x) = x^p$ and $g(x) = x$ are equivalent polynomials modulo p.

Lemma 7 *Two polynomials of degree 1 modulo m, $f(x) = a_1 x + a_0$ and $g(x) = b_1 x + b_0$, are equivalent polynomials modulo m if and only if $f(x) \equiv g(x) \pmod{m}$, i.e., $a_1 \equiv b_1 \pmod{m}$ and $a_0 \equiv b_0 \pmod{m}$.*

Proof: The "if" part is obvious from the definition of equivalent polynomials modulo m, so we focus on the "only if" part. Since $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ are equivalent polynomials modulo m, then $\forall x \in \{0, \cdots, m-1\}$, $f(x) - g(x) = (a_1 - b_1)x + (a_0 - b_0) \equiv 0 \pmod{m}$. Choosing $x \equiv 0 \pmod{m}$, one has $a_0 \equiv b_0 \pmod{m}$. Then, choosing $x \equiv 1 \pmod{m}$, one has $a_1 \equiv b_1 \pmod{m}$. Thus this lemma is proved. ■

Lemma 8 *Two polynomials, $f(x) = a_{n_1} x^{n_1} + \cdots + a_0$ and $g(x) = b_{n_2} x^{n_2} + \cdots + b_0$, are equivalent polynomials modulo m, then $a_0 \equiv b_0 \pmod{m}$.*

Proof: Choosing $x = 0$, one has $f(x) - g(x) = a_0 - b_0 \equiv 0 \pmod{m}$. This lemma is proved. ■

Corollary 1 *Two polynomials, $f(x) = a_n x^n + \cdots + a_2 x^2 + a_0$ and $g(x) = a_n x^n + \cdots + a_2 x^2 + b_0$, are equivalent polynomials modulo m if and only if $a_0 \equiv b_0 \pmod{m}$.*

Lemma 9 *Assume p is a prime and $d \geq 1$. Two polynomials, $f(x) = a_{p-1} x^{p-1} + \cdots + a_0$ and $g(x) = b_{p-1} x^{p-1} + \cdots + b_0$, are equivalent polynomials modulo p^d if and only if $f(x) \equiv g(x) \pmod{p^d}$.*

Proof: The "if" part is obvious true, from the definition of equivalent polynomials modulo p^d. So, we focus on the "only if" part. From $f(x) - g(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{p^d}$, choosing $x = 0 \sim p-1$, one can get the following system of congruences in the matrix form $\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{X}_{a-b} \equiv \boldsymbol{B} \pmod{p^d}$:

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0^2 & \cdots & 0^{p-1} \\ 1 & 1 & 1^2 & \cdots & 1^{p-1} \\ 1 & 2 & 2^2 & \cdots & 2^{p-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & p-1 & (p-1)^2 & \cdots & (p-1)^{p-1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} a_0 - b_0 \\ a_1 - b_1 \\ a_2 - b_2 \\ \vdots \\ a_{p-1} - b_{p-1} \end{bmatrix} \equiv \begin{bmatrix} f(0) - g(0) \\ f(1) - g(1) \\ f(2) - g(2) \\ \vdots \\ f(p-1) - g(p-1) \end{bmatrix} \equiv \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \pmod{p^d}. \qquad (1)$$

Since $\boldsymbol{A}$ is a Vandermonde sub-matrix, one can get $|\boldsymbol{A}| = \prod_{0 \le i < j \le p-1} (j-i)$ [22, §4.4]. From p is a prime and $1 \le (j-i) \le p-1$, one has $\gcd(|\boldsymbol{A}|, p^d) = 1$. Thus, the above system of congruences has a unique set of incongruent solutions. So, $\forall i = 0 \sim p-1$, one has $a_i \equiv b_i \pmod{p^d}$. This completes the proof of this lemma. ■

Note that in the above lemma $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ may be polynomials of degree less than $p-1$ modulo p^d. In this case, the matrix at the left side of the system of congruences may have a smaller size, but its determinant is still relatively prime to p^d.

Corollary 2 *Assume p is a prime. Two polynomials, $f(x) = a_n x^n + \cdots + a_0$ and $g(x) = b_n x^n + \cdots + b_0$, are equivalent polynomials modulo p if and only if $(f(x) \bmod (x^p - x)) \equiv (g(x) \bmod (x^p - x)) \pmod{p}$.*

Proof: This corollary is a direct result of the above lemma and Fermat's Little Theorem. ■

2.5 Null Polynomials modulo m

Definition 7 *A polynomial $f(x)$ of degree $n \ge 0$ modulo m is a null polynomial of degree n modulo m, if $\forall x \in \mathbb{Z}$, $f(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{m}$. Specially, $f(x) = 0$ is a trivial null polynomial of degree 0 modulo m.*

In the following, we give some simple lemmas on null polynomials modulo m. The proofs of the lemmas are very simple, so they are omitted here.

Lemma 10 *If $f(x) = a_n x^n + \cdots + a_1 x + a_0$ is a null polynomial modulo m, then $a_0 \equiv 0 \pmod{m}$.*

Lemma 11 *Given any null polynomial $f(x)$ modulo m, $af(x)$ will still be a null polynomial modulo m, where a is an arbitrary integer.*

Lemma 12 *A polynomial $f(x)$ is a null polynomial modulo m, if and only $af(x)$ is a null polynomial modulo m, where $\gcd(a, m) = 1$.*

Lemma 13 *If $f(x)$ is a null polynomial modulo m and $a \mid m$, then $f(x)$ is still a null polynomial modulo a.*

The most frequently used form of the above lemma is as follows: if $f(x)$ is a null polynomial modulo p^d, then $f(x)$ is still a null polynomial modulo p^i for any integer $i \le d$.

Definition 8 *Denote the least integer $n \ge 1$ such that there exists a null polynomial of degree n modulo m by $\omega_0(m)$ and call it the least null-polynomial degree modulo m. Denote the least integer $n \ge 1$ such that there exists a* ***monic*** *null polynomial of degree n modulo m by $\omega_1(m)$ and call it the least monic null-polynomial degree modulo m. A (monic) null polynomial of degree $\omega_0(m)$ or $\omega_1(m)$ is called a least-degree (monic) null polynomial modulo m.*

Lemma 14 *Every polynomial of degree $\ge \omega_1(m)$ modulo m has one equivalent polynomial of degree $\le \omega_1(m) - 1$ modulo m.*

Proof: It is a direct result of the following two fact that there exists a monic null polynomial of degree $\omega_1(m)$ modulo m. ■

Definition 9 *Assume p is a prime and $d \ge 1$. If $f(x)$ is a null polynomial modulo p^i for any integer $i \le d$ but not a polynomial modulo p^{d+1}, we say $f(x)$ is a null polynomial modulo p up to order d and d is the order of the null polynomial $f(x)$ modulo p. Note that $f(x)$ is a null polynomial modulo p^d can ensure that $f(x)$ is a null polynomial modulo p^i for any integer $i \le d$.*

3 Null Polynomial modulo $m = \prod_{i=1}^{r} p_i^{d_i}$

Theorem 1 *Assume $p_1, \cdots, p_r$ are r distinct prime numbers and $d_1, \cdots, d_r \ge 1$. A polynomial $f(x)$ is a null polynomial modulo $m = \prod_{i=1}^{r} p_i^{d_i}$, if and only if $\forall i = 1 \sim r$, $f(x)$ is a null polynomial modulo $p_i^{d_i}$.*

Proof: It is a direct result of the Chinese remainder theorem. ■

Theorem 2 *Assume* $p_1, \cdots, p_r$ *are* r *distinct prime numbers,* $d_1, \cdots, d_r \geq 1$ *and* $m = \prod_{i=1}^{r} p_i^{d_i}$*. If* $f_1(x), \cdots, f_r(x)$ *are null polynomials of degree* $n_1, \cdots, n_r$ *modulo* $p_1^{d_1}, \cdots, p_r^{d_r}$*, respectively, then there exists one and only one null polynomial* $f(x)$ *of degree* $D = \max_{i=1}^{r}(d_i)$ *modulo* m *in each complete system of polynomial residues modulo* m*, such that* $f(x) \equiv f_i(x) \pmod{p_i^{d_i}}$ *holds for* $i \in \{1, \cdots, r\}$*.*

Proof: Applying the Chinese remainder theorem on each coefficient of the r polynomials[5], one can immediately prove this theorem. ■

Theorem 3 *Assume* $p_1, \cdots, p_r$ *are* r *distinct prime numbers,* $d_1, \cdots, d_r \geq 1$ *and* $m = \prod_{i=1}^{r} p_i^{d_i}$*. Then,* $\omega(m) = \max_{i=1}^{r}(\omega(p_i^{d_i}))$*, i.e., the least degree of null polynomials modulo* m *is* $\max_{i=1}^{r}(\omega(p_i^{d_i}))$*. Here,* $\omega(p_i^{d_i})$ *can be either* $\omega_0(p_i^{d_i})$ *or* $\omega_1(p_i^{d_i})$*.*

Proof: From the above theorem, one can find a (monic) null polynomial of degree D modulo m, so $\omega(m) \leq D$. Next, assume there exists another (monic) null polynomial $g(x)$ of degree $\leq D-1$ modulo m. Then, $g(x)$ is also a (monic) null polynomial modulo each $p_i^{d_i}$. This means $\max_{i=1}^{r}(\omega(p_i^{d_i})) \leq D-1$. We get a contradiction, so $\omega(m) = D$. This theorem is thus proved. ■

With the above theorem, the composite case can be handled easily by handling the r prime power cases.

Corollary 3 *Assume* $p_1, \cdots, p_r$ *are* r *distinct prime numbers,* $d_1, \cdots, d_r \geq 1$*,* $m = \prod_{i=1}^{r} p_i^{d_i}$ *and* $D = \max_{i=1}^{r}(\omega_1(p_i^{d_i}))$*. For each polynomial* $f(x)$ *of degree* $\geq D$ *modulo* m*, there exists an equivalent polynomial of degree* $\leq D-1$ *modulo* m*.*

Proof: This corollary is a direct result of the above theorem. ■

4 Null Polynomials modulo p^d ($d \geq 1$)

In this section, the following questions are focused.

1. What are the values of $\omega_0(p^d)$ and $\omega_1(p^d)$, i.e., the smallest integer n such that there exists at least one (monic) null polynomial modulo p^d?
2. What is the number of (monic) null polynomials of degree n modulo p^d?
3. Is it possible to enumerate all incongruent (monic) null polynomials of degree n modulo p^d?

4.1 Null Polynomials modulo p

Theorem 4 *Assume* p *is a prime. Then,* $\omega_0(p) = \omega_1(p) = p$*.*

Proof: It is a direct result of Lemma 9, since any two equivalent polynomials of degree $\leq p-1$ modulo p are congruent modulo p and $f(x) = x^p - x$ is a null polynomial modulo p. ■

Theorem 5 *Assume* p *is a prime and* $F(x)$ *is a null polynomial of degree* p *modulo* p*. Then,* $f(x)$ *is a null polynomial modulo* p *if and only if* $f(x) \equiv F(x)q(x) \pmod{p}$*, where* $q(x)$ *is an arbitrary polynomial modulo* p*.*

Proof: The "if" part is obviously true. Let us prove the "only if" part. Dividing $f(x)$ by $F(x)$, one can get $f(x) = F(x)q(x) + r(x)$, where $r(x)$ is a polynomial of degree $\leq p-1$ modulo p. Since $F(x)q(x)$ is a null polynomial modulo p, $r(x)$ is also a null polynomial modulo p. From Lemma 9, $r(x)$ is congruent to zero polynomial modulo p. Thus, $f(x) \equiv F(x)q(x) \pmod{p}$. Thus, this theorem is proved. ■

From the above theorem, one can enumerate all null polynomials of degree $n \geq p$ modulo p.

Corollary 4 *Assume* p *is a prime. Then,* $f(x)$ *is a null polynomial modulo* p *if and only if* $f(x) \equiv (x^p - x)q(x)$ $\pmod{p}$*, where* $q(x)$ *is an arbitrary polynomial modulo* p*.*

---

[5] For polynomials of degree less than D, the higher coefficients are assigned to be zeros.

Proof: It is a direct result of the above theorem, since $x^p - x$ is a null polynomial modulo p. ■

Corollary 5 *Assume p is a prime and $f(x)$ is a null polynomial of degree p modulo p, then $f(x) \equiv a(x^p - x) \pmod{p}$, where $\gcd(a, p) = 1$. That is, $x^p - x$ is the **only one monic** null polynomial modulo p.*

Proof: It is a direct result of the above theorem. Note that $f(x)$ congruent to zero polynomial modulo p if $\gcd(a, p) > 1$, i.e., $a \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$. ■

Corollary 6 *Assume p is a prime, then $x(x-1)\cdots(x-(p-1)) \equiv (x^p - x) \pmod{p}$.*

Remark 1 *Note that the above corollary is generally proved in number theory via Lagrange's Theorem. Since Lemma 9 and Theorem 4 do not depend on the Lagrange's Theorem, so we give an independent proof of the well-known result. Note that Wilson's Theorem can be derived from this corollary by choosing $x = 0$.*

Definition 10 *In the following of this paper, to facilitate the discussion, define $\mathcal{F}_p(x) = \prod_{i=0}^{p-1}(x-i) = x(x-1)\cdots(x-(p-1))$. This special polynomial will be frequently used to derive some important results.*

Definition 11 *Assume p is a prime. Define $\Lambda(x) = \prod_{\substack{0 \le j \le p-1 \\ j \not\equiv x \pmod{p}}} (x-j)$.*

Lemma 15 *Assume p is a prime, then $\forall x \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\Lambda(x) \equiv (p-1)! \equiv -1 \pmod{p}$.*

Proof: Assuming $i = (x \bmod p) \in \{0, \cdots, p-1\}$, one has $\Lambda(x) \equiv \Lambda(i) = \prod_{\substack{0 \le j \le p-1 \\ j \ne i}} (i-j) \equiv \prod_{i+1 \le j \le p-1}(p+i-j)\prod_{0 \le j \le i-1}(i-j) = (p-1)\cdots(i+1)i! = (p-1)! \equiv -1 \pmod{p}$. In fact, this lemma is true since $\{x-j\}_{\substack{0 \le j \le p-1 \\ j \not\equiv x \pmod{p}}}$ actually forms a reduced system of residues modulo p. ■

Theorem 6 *Assume p is a prime. Then, $\forall i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\forall j \in \{0, \cdots, p-1\}$, $\mathcal{F}_p(ip+j) \equiv -ip \pmod{p^2}$, i.e., $\frac{\mathcal{F}_p(ip+j)}{p} \equiv -i \pmod{p}$.*

Proof: From the above lemma, one has $\frac{\mathcal{F}_p(ip+j)}{p} = \frac{(ip)\Lambda(ip+j)}{p} = i\Lambda(ip+j) \equiv -i \pmod{p}$. ■

Yet another form of the above theorem is as follows.

Theorem 7 *Assume p is a prime. Then, $\forall x \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\frac{\mathcal{F}_p(x)}{p} = \lfloor x/p \rfloor \Lambda(x) \equiv -\lfloor x/p \rfloor \pmod{p}$.*

The above theorem is very important as a basic feature of $\mathcal{F}_p(x)$ to generalize the results modulo p to modulo any power of p.

4.2 Null Polynomials modulo p^d ($d \ge 1$): Some Trivial Results

This subsection gives some trivial results on null polynomials modulo p^d, some of which (especially Corollary 8) will be frequently cited later to get some more important results.

Theorem 8 *Assume p is a prime and $d \ge 1$. Then, $\omega_0(p^d) = p$.*

Proof: Note that $p^{d-1}(x^p - x)$ is a null polynomial modulo p^d, so $\omega_0(p^d) = p$. ■

From the above theorem, one can see that $\omega_0(p^d)$ is trivial for studying null polynomial modulo p^d. So in following we will focus on $\omega_1(p^d)$ only. At first, we introduce some preliminary lemmas for further discussions. They will be cited later without explicit citations.

Lemma 16 *Assume p and $d \ge 1$. If $f(x) = a_n x^n + \cdots + a_1 x$ is a null polynomial of degree $< \omega_1(p^d)$ modulo p^d, then one of the following results holds:*

- *$f(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{p^d}$, i.e., $f(x) = p^d f^*(x)$, where $f^*(x)$ is any integer polynomial;*
- *$f(x) \equiv ap^i f^*(x) \pmod{p^d}$, where $\gcd(a, p) = 1$, $i \in \{1, \cdots, d\}$ and $f^*(x)$ is a monic null polynomial modulo p^{d-i}.*

Proof: When $f(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{p^d}$, one has $f(x) = p^d f^*(x)$, where $f^*(x)$ can be any polynomials. When $f(x) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p^d}$, assuming $p \nmid a_n$, then $\gcd(a_n, p) = 1$, so there exists an inverse $\bar{a}_n$ such that $\bar{a}_n a_n \equiv 1 \pmod{p^d}$. Multiplying $f(x)$ by $\bar{a}_n$, one gets a monic null polynomial $f^*(x) = x^n + \cdots + \bar{a}_n a_1 x$ modulo p^d. This conflicts with the fact $n < \omega_1(p^d)$. So $p \mid a$ is always true and one has $a_n = ap^i$, where $\gcd(a, p) = 1$ and $i \in \{1, \cdots, d-1\}$. Choosing $f^*(x) =$ This proves this lemma. ■

Corollary 7 *Assume* p *and* $d \geq 1$*. If* $f(x) = a_n x^n + \cdots + a_1 x$ *is a null polynomial of degree* $< \omega_1(p^d)$ *modulo* p^d*, then* $f(x) = pf^*(x) \pmod{p^d}$*, where* $f^*(x)$ *is a null polynomial modulo* p^{d-1}*.*

Proof: It is a direct result of the above lemma. ■

Lemma 17 *Assume* p *is a polynomial,* $1 \leq d_1 < \cdots < d_n < d$ *and* $F_1(x), \cdots, F_n(x)$ *are monic null polynomials of degree* $\omega_1(p^{d_1}) < \cdots < \omega_1(p^{d_n})$ *modulo* $p^{d_1}, \cdots, p^{d_n}$*, respectively. If* $f(x)$ *is a null polynomial modulo* p^d*, then*

$$f(x) \equiv \sum_{i=n}^{1} F_i(x) p^{n-i} q_i(x) + p^n q_0(x) \pmod{p^d},$$

where $q_0(x)$ *is a polynomial of degree less than* $\omega_1(p^{d_1})$ *modulo* p^d *and* $q_i(x)$ *(*$1 \leq i \leq n-1$*) is a polynomial of degree less than* $\omega_1(p^{d_{i+1}}) - \omega_1(p^{d_i})$ *modulo* p^d*.*

Proof: We use induction on n to prove this lemma.

When $n = 1$, dividing $f(x)$ by $F_1(x)$, one has $f(x) = F_1(x)q_1(x) + r_1(x)$, where $r_1(x)$ is of degree less than $\omega_1(p^{d_1})$ modulo p^d. Since $f(x)$ and $F_1(x)q_1(x)$ are both null polynomials modulo p^{d_1}, $r_1(x)$ is also a null polynomial modulo p^{d_1}. Considering the degree of $r_1(x)$ is less than $\omega_1(p^{d_1})$, so one has $r_1(x) \equiv pr_1^*(x) \pmod{p^{d_1}}$ and then $r_1(x) \equiv pr_1^{(1)}(x) + p^{d_1} r_1^{(1)}(x) \equiv pq_0(x) \pmod{p^d}$. This proves the case of $n = 1$.

Assume this lemma is true for any integer $\leq n-1$, let us prove the case of $n \geq 2$. Dividing $f(x)$ by $F_n(x)$, one has $f(x) = F_n(x)q_n(x) + r_n(x)$, where $r_n(x)$ is a polynomial of degree $< \omega_1(p^{d_n})$ modulo p^d. Since $f(x)$ and $F_n(x)q_n(x)$ are both null polynomial modulo p^{d_n}, $r_n(x)$ is also a null polynomial modulo p^{d_n}. Considering $r_n(x)$ is of degree less than $\omega_1(p^{d_n})$, one has $r_n(x) \equiv pr_n^*(x) \pmod{p^{d_n}}$ and then $r_n(x) \equiv pr_n^{(1)}(x) + p^{d_n} r_n^{(2)}(x) \equiv pr_n^{**}(x) \pmod{p^d}$, where $r_n^{**}(x)$ is a null polynomial of degree less than $\omega_1(p^{d_n})$ modulo $p^{d_{n-1}}$. Then, applying the hypothesis on $r_n^{**}(x)$, the case of $d \geq 2$ is proved. ■

Corollary 8 *Assume* p *is a polynomial,* $d \geq 2$ *and* $F_1(x)$*,* $\cdots$*,* $F_{d-1}(x)$ *are monic null polynomials of degree* $\omega_1(p)$*,* $\cdots$*,* $\omega_1(p^{d-1})$ *modulo* p*,* $\cdots$*,* p^{d-1}*, respectively. If* $f(x)$ *is a null polynomial modulo* p^d*, then*

$$f(x) \equiv \sum_{n=d-1}^{1} F_n(x) p^{d-1-n} q_n(x) + p^{d-1} q_0(x) \pmod{p^d},$$

where $q_0(x)$ *is a polynomial of degree less than* $\omega_1(p)$ *modulo* p^d *and* $q_n(x)$ *(*$1 \leq n \leq d-2$*) is a polynomial of degree less than* $\omega_1(p^{n+1}) - \omega_1(p^n)$ *modulo* p^d*. If there exists* $1 \leq n_1 < n_2 \leq d-1$ *such that* $\omega_1(p^{n_1}) = \cdots = \omega_1(p^{n_2})$*, then* $q_{n_1}(x) = \cdots = q_{n_2-1}(x) = 0$*.*

Explain: The above corollary is a direct result of Lemma 17. This corollary makes it possible to use induction on d to derive null polynomials modulo p^d from null polynomials modulo lower prime powers $p, \cdots, p^{d-1}$. □

Lemma 18 *Assume* p *is a prime and* $d \geq 1$*. Then,* $0 \leq \omega_1(p^{d+1}) - \omega_1(p^d) \leq p$*.*

Proof: From Lemma 13, one can easily get $\omega_1(p^{d+1}) \geq \omega_1(p^d)$. Then, one has $\omega_1(p^{d+1}) \leq \omega_1(p^d) + p$ from the following fact: if $f(x)$ is a monic null polynomial modulo p^d, then $f(x)\mathcal{F}_p(x)$ is a monic null polynomial modulo p^{d+1}. So, one has $0 \leq \omega_1(p^{d+1}) - \omega_1(p^d) \leq p$. ■

4.3 Null Polynomials modulo p^d: The Case of $2 \leq d \leq p(p+1)+1$

In this subsection, we study the case of $2 \leq d \leq p(p+1)+1$. The results obtained on these special cases lead to a recursive way to handle the general case of $d \geq 1$ (as shown in next subsection).

4.3.1 The Case of $2 \leq d \leq p$

Lemma 19 *Assume p is a prime. A polynomial $f(x)$ is a null polynomial modulo p^2, if and only if $f(x) \equiv \mathcal{F}_p(x)q_1(x) \equiv (\mathcal{F}_p(x))^2 q_1^*(x) + p\mathcal{F}_p(x)q_0^*(x) \pmod{p^2}$, where $q_1(x)$ is a null polynomial modulo p and $q_0^*(x), q_1^*(x)$ can be any integer polynomials.*

Proof: The "if" part is obviously true, so we focus on the "only if" part.

From Corollary 8, one has $f(x) \equiv \mathcal{F}_p(x)q_1(x) + pq_0(x) \pmod{p^2}$, where $q_0(x)$ is of degree $\leq p-1$ modulo p^2. Choosing $x = 0$, one has $pq_0(0) \equiv 0 \pmod{p^2} \Rightarrow q_0(0) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$. Choosing $x = ip$, where $i \in \{1, \cdots, p-1\}$, one has $ip\Lambda(ip)q_1(ip) + pq_0(ip) \equiv 0 \pmod{p^2} \Rightarrow i\Lambda(ip)q_1(ip) + q_0(ip) \equiv 0 \pmod{p} \Rightarrow -iq_1(0) \equiv 0 \pmod{p} \Rightarrow q_1(0) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$. Next, choosing $x = j \in \{1, \cdots, p-1\}$, one has $pq_0(j) \equiv 0 \pmod{p^2} \Rightarrow q_0(j) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$. Then, choosing $x = p+j \in \{p+1, \cdots, 2p-1\}$, one has $p\Lambda(p+j)q_1(p+j) + pq_0(p+j) \equiv 0 \pmod{p^2} \Rightarrow \Lambda(p+j)q_1(j) \equiv 0 \pmod{p} \Rightarrow q_1(j) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$. Combining the above results, one can see that both $q_1(x)$ and $q_0(x)$ are null polynomials modulo p. However, since $q_0(x)$ is a null polynomial of degree less than p, one immediately gets $q_0(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ and then $pq_0(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{p^2}$. Thus, $f(x) \equiv \mathcal{F}_p(x)q_1(x) \pmod{p^2}$. Considering $q_1(x) \equiv \mathcal{F}_p(x)q_1^*(x) \pmod{p}$, one has $q_1(x) \equiv \mathcal{F}_p(x)q_1^*(x) + pq_0^*(x) \pmod{p^2}$. As a final result, $f(x) \equiv (\mathcal{F}_p(x))^2 q_1^*(x) + p\mathcal{F}_p(x)q_0^*(x) \pmod{p^2}$, where $q_0^*(x)$ and $q_1^*(x)$ can be any integer polynomials (without the limit on the degree modulo p^2). This completes the proof of this lemma. ■

Remark 2 *In the above lemma, the two different representations of the necessary and sufficient conditions of $f(x)$ may have different usages. The first one, $f(x) \equiv \mathcal{F}_p(x)q_1(x) \pmod{p^2}$, is better to show the law basic law behind the result and to organize the proof; while the second one, $f(x) \equiv (\mathcal{F}_p(x))^2 q_1^*(x) + p\mathcal{F}_p(x)q_0^*(x) \pmod{p^2}$, is better to enumerate all null polynomials modulo p^2. In the following of this section, we continue to adopt the two representations simultaneously.*

Lemma 20 *Assume p is a prime, then $\omega_1(p^2) = 2p$.*

Proof: From the above lemma, to get a monic null polynomial modulo p^2, it is obvious that $q_1(x) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$. Since the least degrees of $q_1(x)$ and $\mathcal{F}_p(x)$ are both p, the least degree of $f(x)$ is $p+p = 2p$, i.e., $\omega_1(p^2) = 2p$, where note that $f_1(x)$ is a monic polynomial modulo p^2 if $q_1(x)$ is a monic polynomial modulo p^2. This completes the proof of this lemma. ■

Theorem 9 *Assume p is a prime and $2 \leq d \leq p$. A polynomial $f(x)$ is a null polynomial modulo p^d if and only if $f(x) \equiv \sum_{n=d}^{1} p^{d-n}(\mathcal{F}_p(x))^n q_n^*(x) \pmod{p^d}$, where $q_1^*(x)$, $\cdots$, $q_{d-1}^*(x)$ are **any** polynomials of degree less than p modulo p^d and $q_d(x)$ is **any** polynomial of **any** degree modulo p.*

Proof: The "if" part is obviously true, so we only prove the "only if" part via induction on d.

When $d = 2$, this theorem has been proved above. Let us use induction on d to prove the case of $3 \leq d \leq p$, under the assumption that this theorem is true for all integers not greater than $d-1$.

Apparently, the hypothesis means that $\omega_1(p^c) = pc$ when $c < d$. Then, from Corollary 8, one has $f(x) \equiv \sum_{n=d-1}^{0} p^{d-1-n}(\mathcal{F}_p(x))^n q_n(x) \pmod{p^d}$, where $q_0(x)$, $\cdots$, $q_{d-2}(x)$ are of degree less than $\omega_1(p^{n+1}) - \omega_1(p^n) = p$.

Assuming $x = ip + j$, where i is any integer and $j \in \{0, \cdots, p-1\}$. One can see that $\{ip + j\}$ forms a completes system of residues modulo p^d when i runs through a complete system of residues modulo p^{d-1}. Substituting $x = ip + j$ into $f(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{p^d}$, one has $\sum_{n=d-1}^{0} p^{d-1-n}(ip\Lambda(ip+j))^n q_n(ip+j) \equiv 0 \pmod{p^d}$. This congruence can be further simplified as $\sum_{n=d-1}^{0}(-i)^n q_n(j) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$, where note that $\Lambda(ip+j) \equiv -1 \pmod{p}$.

Choosing $i \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$, one gets $q_0(j) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ for any j. Considering the degree of $q_0(x)$ is less than p, $q_0(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{p} \Rightarrow p^{d-1}q_0(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{p^d}$, so this term can be removed. The congruence is simplified to be $\sum_{n=d-1}^{1}(-i)^n q_n(j) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$. To solve the value of each $q_n(j)$ when $n \geq 1$, consider the polynomial $h_j(x) = \sum_{n=d-1}^{1}(-1)^n q_n(j)x^n$ of degree $d-1 \leq p-1$. Since $h_j(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ holds for any integer x and $j \in \{0, \cdots, p-1\}$, one immediately has $(-1)^n q_n(j) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ and then $q_n(j) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ for all values of $n \geq 1$ and $j \in \{0, \cdots, p-1\}$. Thus, finally we get the result that $q_1(x), \cdots, q_{d-1}(x)$ are all null polynomials modulo p. Since the first $d-2$ polynomials are of degree less than p, one immediately has $q_n(x) \equiv pq_n^*(x) \pmod{p^d}$. The last polynomial is of any degree, so $q_{d-1}(x) \equiv \mathcal{F}_p(x)q_d^*(x) + pq_{d-1}^*(x) \pmod{p^d}$, where $q_{d-1}^*(x)$ is also of degree less than p modulo p^d. Substituting the $d-1$ congruences into $f(x)$, one has $f(x) \equiv \sum_{n=d}^{1} p^{d-n}(\mathcal{F}_p(x))^n q_n^*(x) \pmod{p^d}$. Thus, the case of $3 \leq d \leq p$ is proved and the proof of this theorem is also completed. ■

Theorem 10 *Assume p is a prime and $2 \leq d \leq p$. Then, $\omega_1(p^d) = pd$.*

Proof: It is a direct result of the above theorem, since the least degree of $q_d^*(x)$ corresponding to a monic null polynomial modulo p^d is 0. ■

4.3.2 The Case of $d = p + 1$

Theorem 11 *Assume p is a prime. A polynomial $f(x)$ is a null polynomial modulo p^{p+1}, if and only if the following conditions hold simultaneously:*

- *$f(x) \equiv \sum_{n=p}^{1} p^{p-n}(\mathcal{F}_p(x))^n q_n(x) \pmod{p^{p+1}}$, where $q_1(x), \cdots, q_{p-1}(x)$ are polynomial of degree less than p modulo p^{p+1};*
- *$q_p(x)$ is any polynomial of any degree modulo p^{p+1} and $\sum_{n=p-1}^{1}(-i)^n q_n(j) \equiv iq_p(j) \pmod{p}$ holds for $i = \lfloor x/p \rfloor$ and $j = x \bmod p$.*

Proof: At first, let us prove the "only if" part.

Since $\omega_1(p^p) = p^2$, one has $f(x) \equiv \sum_{n=p}^{0} p^{p-n}(\mathcal{F}_p(x))^n q_n(x) \pmod{p^{p+1}}$. Assuming $x = ip + j$, where i runs through a complete system of residues modulo p^p and $j \in \{0, \cdots, p-1\}$. Substituting $x = ip + j$ into $f(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{p^{p+1}}$, one has $\sum_{n=p}^{0} p^{p-n}(ip\Lambda(ip+j))^n q_n(ip+j) \equiv 0 \pmod{p^{p+1}}$. This congruence can be reduced to be $\sum_{n=p}^{0}(-i)^n q_n(j) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$, where note that $\Lambda(ip+j) \equiv -1 \pmod{p}$.

Choosing $i \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$, one immediately gets $q_0(j) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$, which means that $p^p q_0(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{p^{p+1}}$, so this term can be removed. Next, for a given value of j, to solve each of other $q_n(j)$, one has the following system of congruences: for $i \equiv 1 \sim p-1 \pmod{p}$, $\sum_{n=p}^{1}(-i)^n q_n(j) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$. Write the $p-1$ congruences as the matrix form after moving $(-i)^p q_p(j)$ to the right side as follows,

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ 2 & 2^2 & \cdots & 2^{p-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ (p-1) & (p-1)^2 & \cdots & (p-1)^{p-1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} -q_1(j) \\ (-1)^2 q_2(j) \\ \vdots \\ (-1)^{p-1} q_{p-1}(j) \end{bmatrix} \equiv \begin{bmatrix} -(-1)^p q_p(j) \\ -(-2)^p q_p(j) \\ \vdots \\ -(-(p-1))^p q_p(j) \end{bmatrix} \equiv \begin{bmatrix} q_p(j) \\ 2q_p(j) \\ \vdots \\ (p-1)q_p(j) \end{bmatrix} \pmod{p}.$$

Since the matrix at left side is a Vondermande matrix, one can see that its determinant is relatively prime to p. So, for any value of $q_p(j)$, there exists a unique set of incongruent solutions of $\{(-1)^n q_n(j)\}_{1 \leq n \leq p-1}$ modulo p. That is, there is a unique set of incongruent solutions to $\{q_n(j)\}_{1 \leq n \leq p-1}$ modulo p. Since every function over $\{0, \cdots, p-1\}$ corresponds to a unique polynomial of degree $\leq p-1$ modulo p, there exists a unique polynomial $q_n(x)$ $(1 \leq n \leq p-1)$ of degree $\leq p-1$ modulo p, for each distinct polynomial $q_p(x)$ modulo p.

The "if" part can be easily proved since $\sum_{n=p-1}^{1}(-i)^n q_n(j) \equiv iq_p(j) \pmod{p}$ actually means $f(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{p^{p+1}}$. Thus, this theorem is proved. ■

Yet another form of the above theorem is as follow, in which the free polynomial becomes $q_1(x)$.

Theorem 12 *Assume p is a prime. A polynomial $f(x)$ is a null polynomial modulo p^{p+1}, if and only if the following conditions hold simultaneously:*

- *$f(x) \equiv \sum_{n=p}^{1} p^{p-n}(\mathcal{F}_p(x))^n q_n(x) \pmod{p^{p+1}}$, where $q_1(x), \cdots, q_{p-1}(x)$ are polynomial of degree less than p modulo p^{p+1};*
- *$q_1(x)$ is any polynomial of degree less than p modulo p^{p+1} and $\sum_{n=p}^{2}(-i)^n q_n(j) \equiv -iq_1(j) \pmod{p}$ holds for $i = \lfloor x/p \rfloor$ and $j = x \bmod p$.*

Proof: In the proof of the above theorem, moving $-q_1(j)$ to the right side of the congruence, one has

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ 2^2 & 2^3 & \cdots & 2^p \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ (p-1)^2 & (p-1)^3 & \cdots & (p-1)^p \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} (-1)^2 q_2(j) \\ (-1)^3 q_3(j) \\ \vdots \\ (-1)^p q_p(j) \end{bmatrix} \equiv \begin{bmatrix} -q_1(j) \\ -2q_1(j) \\ \vdots \\ -(p-1)q_1(j) \end{bmatrix} \pmod{p}. \qquad (2)$$

It is obvious that the determinant of the matrix at the left side is still relatively prime to p, so there is a unique solution to each value of $q_1(j)$. Thus, this theorem is true. ■

Theorem 13 *In the above theorems, 1) $q_1(x)$ or $q_p(x)$ uniquely determines the polynomial functions derived from all other $p-1$ polynomials modulo p; 2) if $q_1(x)$ or $q_p(x)$ is of degree 0, all other $p-1$ polynomials are of degree 0; 3) $q_1(j) \equiv 0 \pmod{p} \Leftrightarrow q_p(j) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ and $q_1(j) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p} \Leftrightarrow q_p(j) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$.*

Proof: The proof of this theorem is actually included in the proof of the above theorem. ■

Remark 3 *Specially, when $q_1(x)$ or $q_p(x)$ is a null polynomial modulo p, all polynomials are null polynomials modulo p. In this case, $f(x) \equiv \sum_{n=p+1}^{1} p^{p+1-n}(\mathcal{F}_p(x))^n q_n^*(x) \pmod{p^{p+1}}$, where $q_1^*(x), \cdots, q_p^*(x)$ are any polynomials of degree less than p modulo p^{p+1} and $q_{p+1}^*(x)$ is any polynomial of any degree modulo p^{p+1}. However, null polynomials in this form are not least-degree null polynomials modulo p^{p+1}.*

Theorem 14 *Assume p is a prime, then $\omega_1(p^{p+1}) = p^2$.*

Proof: From the above theorem, to get a monic null polynomial modulo p^{p+1}, it is obvious that $q_p(x) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$. Since the least degree of $q_p(x)$ is 0 and the degree of $(\mathcal{F}_p(x))^p$ is p^2, the least degree of $f(x)$ is also p^2, i.e., $\omega_1(p^{p+1}) = p^2$, where note that $f(x)$ is a monic polynomial modulo p^3 if $q_p(x)$ is a monic polynomial modulo p^{p+1}. This theorem is thus proved. ■

Example 1 *When $p = 2$, find a monic null polynomial of degree $\omega_1(2^3) = 2^2 = 4$ modulo 2^3.*

Solution: In this case, only one congruence is left: $q_1(j) \equiv -q_2(j) \equiv q_2(j) \pmod{p}$. Choosing $q_1(x) = q_2(x) = 1$, one gets a monic null polynomial of degree 4 modulo 2^3: $f(x) = (x^2-x)^2 + 2(x^2-x) = x^4 - 2x^3 + 3x^2 - 2x$. Experiments have been made to verify this null polynomial. □

Example 2 *When $p = 3$, find a monic null polynomial of degree $\omega_1(3^4) = 3^2 = 9$ modulo 3^4.*

Solution: Choosing $q_3(x) = 1$, the system of congruences becomes

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 2 & 2^2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} -q_1(j) \\ q_2(j) \end{bmatrix} \equiv \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix} \pmod{p} \Rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} q_1(j) \\ q_2(j) \end{bmatrix} \equiv \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix} \pmod{p}.$$

Solving this system of congruences, one has $q_1(j) \equiv 2 \pmod{p}$ and $q_2(j) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ for any integer j. So, choosing $q_1(x) = 2$ and $q_2(x) = 0$, one gets a null polynomial $f(x) = (x(x-1)(x-2))^3 + 3^2(x(x-1)(x-2)) \cdot 2 = (x^3 - 3x^2 + 2x)^3 + 18(x^3 - 3x^2 + 2x) \equiv x^9 - 9x^8 + 33x^7 + 18x^6 - 15x^5 - 36x^4 + 26x^3 + 27x^2 + 36x \pmod{3^4}$. Experiments have been made to verify this null polynomial. □

Next, we give a least-degree monic null polynomial modulo p^{p+1} by combining $\mathcal{F}_p(x)$ directly, without solving the system of congruences.

Definition 12 *Assume p is a prime. Define $\mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(x) = \prod_{i=0}^{p-1}(\mathcal{F}_p(x) - ip)$. The following theorem ensures that this polynomial is a least-degree monic null polynomial modulo p^{p+1}, which plays an important role to construct least-degree monic null polynomials modulo p^d, together with $\mathcal{F}_p(x)$, the null polynomial modulo p.*

Theorem 15 *Assume p is a prime and $d \geq 2$. Then, $\mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(x)$ is a least-degree monic null polynomial modulo p^{p+1}.*

Proof: Consider $\frac{\mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(x)}{p^p} = \prod_{i=0}^{p-1}\left(\frac{\mathcal{F}_p(x)}{p} - i\right)$. Since $\frac{\mathcal{F}_p(x)}{p}$ is an integer, there must exists $i \in \{0, \cdots, p-1\}$ such that $\frac{\mathcal{F}_p(x)}{p} - i \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$. So $\frac{\mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(x)}{p^p}$ is a null polynomial modulo p and then $\mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(x)$ is a null polynomial modulo p^{p+1}. Considering that $\deg(\mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(x), p^{p+1}) = \omega_1(p^{p+1}) = p^2$, this theorem is thus proved. ■

Lemma 21 *Assume p is a prime. Then, $\forall i, x \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\lfloor (ip^2 + x)/p \rfloor \equiv \lfloor x/p \rfloor \pmod{p}$.*

Proof: It is easy to prove this lemma as follows: $\lfloor (ip^2 + x)/p \rfloor = \lfloor ip + x/p \rfloor = ip + \lfloor x/p \rfloor \equiv \lfloor x/p \rfloor \pmod{p}$. ■

Lemma 22 *Assume p is a prime. Then, $\forall i, j, x \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\lfloor j\Lambda(ip^2 + x)/p \rfloor \equiv \lfloor j\Lambda(x)/p \rfloor \pmod{p}$.*

Proof: One has $j\Lambda(ip^2+x) = j\prod_{\substack{0\le k\le p-1\\ k\not\equiv ip^2+x \pmod p}}(ip^2+(x-k)) = jA(ip^2+x)p^2 + j\prod_{\substack{0\le k\le p-1\\ k\not\equiv x \pmod p}}(x-k) = jA(ip^2+x)p^2+j\Lambda(x)$, where $A(ip^2+x)$ is the sum of all terms in $\Lambda(ip^2+x)$ that can be divided by p^2. Then, from the above lemma, one immediately prove $\lfloor j\Lambda(ip^2+x)/p\rfloor \equiv \lfloor j\Lambda(x)/p\rfloor \pmod p$. ■

Theorem 16 *Assume p is a prime. Then, $\forall i\in\mathbb{Z}$ and $\forall j_0, j_1\in\{0,\cdots,p-1\}$, $\frac{\mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(ip^2+j_1p+j_0)}{p^{p+1}} \equiv i-\lfloor j_1\Lambda(j_1p+j_0)/p\rfloor \pmod p$.*

Proof: Assuming $x=ip^2+j_1p+j_0$, similar to the proof of the above theorem, one has $\frac{\mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(x)}{p^{p+1}} = \frac{\mathcal{F}_p((ip+j_1)\Lambda(x))}{p}$. Then, $\frac{\mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(x)}{p^{p+1}} \equiv (i\Lambda(x)+\lfloor j_1\Lambda(x)/p\rfloor)\,\Lambda((ip+j_1)\Lambda(x))) \equiv -(-i+\lfloor j_1\Lambda(x)/p\rfloor) = i-\lfloor j_1\Lambda(x)/p\rfloor \equiv i-\lfloor j_1\Lambda(j_1p+j_0)/p\rfloor \pmod p$. This immediately proves this theorem. ■

From the above theorem, one can easily derive the following corollaries.

Corollary 9 *Assume p is a prime. Then, $\forall j\in\{0,\cdots,p^2-1\}$, $\left\{\frac{\mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(ip^2+j)}{p^{p+1}}\right\}$ forms a complete system of residues modulo p when i runs through a complete system of residues modulo p.*

Corollary 10 *Assume p is a prime. Then, $\forall i\in\mathbb{Z}$ and $\forall j\in\{0,\cdots,p^3-1\}$, $\frac{\mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(ip^3+j)}{p^{p+1}} \equiv \frac{\mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(j)}{p^{p+1}} \pmod p$, i.e., $\frac{\mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(x)}{p^{p+1}}$ forms a periodic function modulo p of period p^3.*

Corollary 11 *Assume p is a prime. Then, $\forall i\in\mathbb{Z}$ and $\forall j\in\{0,\cdots,p-1\}$, $\frac{\mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(ip^2+j)}{p^{p+1}} \equiv i \pmod p$.*

4.3.3 The Case of $p+2\le d\le 2p+1$

Lemma 23 *Assume p is a prime. A polynomial $f(x)$ is a null polynomial modulo p^{p+2}, if and only if*

$$f(x) \equiv \mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(x)\mathcal{F}_p(x)q^*_{p+2}(x) + p\mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(x)q^*_{p+1}(x) + \sum_{n=p}^{1} p^{p+2-n}(\mathcal{F}_p(x))^n q^*_n(x) \pmod{p^{p+2}},$$

where $q^*_1(x)$, $\cdots$, $q^*_{p+1}(x)$ are any polynomials of degree less than p modulo p^{p+2} and $q^*_{p+2}(x)$ is any polynomial of any degree modulo p^{p+2}.

Proof: The "if" part is obvious, so we only prove the "only if" part.

From Corollary 8, one has $f(x)\equiv \mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(x)q_{p+1}(x)+\sum_{n=p-1}^{0} p^{p+1-n}(\mathcal{F}_p(x))^n q_n(x) \pmod{p^{p+2}}$, where $q_0(x)$, $\cdots$, $q_{p-1}(x)$ are polynomials of degree less than p modulo p^{p+2}.

Assuming $x=ip+j$, where $j\in\{0,\cdots,p-1\}$ and i runs through a complete system of residues modulo p^{p+1}. Substituting $x=ip+j$ into $f(x)\equiv 0 \pmod{p^{p+2}}$, one has $\mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(ip+j)q_{p+1}(ip+j)+\sum_{n=p-1}^{0} p^{p+1-n}(-ip)^n q_n(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{p^{p+2}} \Rightarrow \frac{\mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(ip+j)}{p^{p+1}}q_{p+1}(j)+\sum_{n=p-1}^{0}(-i)^n q_n(j)\equiv 0 \pmod p$. Choosing $i=0$, one has $\mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(j)=0$ and $\sum_{n=p-1}^{1}(-i)^n q_n(x)\equiv 0 \pmod p$, so $q_0(j)\equiv 0 \pmod p$. Then, removing $q_0(j)$ from the congruence, one has $\sum_{n=p-1}^{1}(-i)^n q_n(j) \equiv -\frac{\mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(ip+j)}{p^{p+1}}q_{p+1}(j) \pmod p$. From Theorem 27, choosing $i_1\not\equiv i_2 \pmod p$, one has $\frac{\mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(i_1p^2+j)}{p^{p+1}} = i_1 \not\equiv i_2 = \frac{\mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(i_2p^2+j)}{p^{p+1}} \pmod p$. Then, one has $(i_1-i_2)q_{p+1}(j)\equiv 0 \pmod p$, which immediately leads to the fact that $q_{p+1}(j)\equiv 0 \pmod p$ and $q_1(j)\equiv\cdots\equiv q_{p-1}(j)\equiv 0 \pmod p$ hold for any integer $j\in\{0,\cdots,p-1\}$. That is, all the p polynomials are null polynomials modulo p. In a similar way used in above proofs, we can write each polynomial as two parts, and then prove this lemma. ■

Lemma 24 *Assume p is a prime, then $\omega_1(p^{p+2})=p(p+1)$.*

Proof: From the above lemma, choosing $q_{p+2}(x)=1$, this lemma is thus proved. ■

Theorem 17 *Assume p is a prime and $1\le d\le p$. A polynomial $f(x)$ is a null polynomial modulo p^{p+1+d}, if and only if*

$$f(x)\equiv \sum_{n_1=d}^{0} p^{d-n_1}\mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(x)(\mathcal{F}_p(x))^{n_1}q^*_{p+n_1}(x) + \sum_{n_2=p}^{1} p^{p+1+d-n_2}(\mathcal{F}_p(x))^{n_2}q^*_{n_2}(x) \pmod{p^{p+1+d}},$$

where $q_1(x)$, $\cdots$, $q_{p+d}(x)$ are any polynomials of degree less than p modulo p^{p+1+d} and $q_{p+1+d}(x)$ is any polynomial of any degree modulo p^{p+1+d}.

Proof: The "if" part is obvious. We use induction on d to prove the "only if" part.

When $d = 1$, this theorem has been proved in the above lemma. Under the assumption that this theorem is true for any integer less than d, let us prove the case of $d \geq 2$.

Note that this theorem means that $\forall 1 \leq n \leq d-1$, $\omega_1(p^{p+1+n}) = p(p+n)$, so $\mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(x)(\mathcal{F}_p(x))^n$ is a least-degree monic null polynomial modulo p^{p+1+n}. Then, from Corollary 8, one has

$$f(x) \equiv \sum_{n_1=d-1}^{0} p^{d-1-n_1}\mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(x)(\mathcal{F}_p(x))^{n_1} q_{p+1+n_1}(x) + \sum_{n_2=p-1}^{0} p^{p+d-n_2}(\mathcal{F}_p(x))^{n_2} q_{n_2}(x) \pmod{p^{p+1+d}},$$

where except $q_0(x), \cdots, q_{p+d-1}(x)$ are of degree less than p.

Assuming $x = ip + j$, where $j \in \{0, \cdots, p-1\}$ and i runs through a complete system of residues modulo p^{p+1}. Substituting $x = ip + j$ into $f(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{p^{p+2}}$, one has

$$\sum_{n_1=d-1}^{0} p^{d-1-n_1}\mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(ip+j)(-ip)^{n_1} q_{p+1+n_1}(ip+j) + \sum_{n_2=p-1}^{0} p^{p+d-n_2}(-ip)^{n_2} q_{n_2}(ip+j) \equiv 0 \pmod{p^{p+1+d}},$$

which leads to $\frac{\mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(ip+j)}{p^{p+1}} \sum_{n_1=d-1}^{0}(-i)^{n_1} q_{p+1+n_1}(j) + \sum_{n_2=p-1}^{0}(-i)^{n_2} q_{n_2}(j) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$. From Corollary 9, $\forall i, j \in \{0, \cdots, p-1\}$, $\left\{\frac{\mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(kp^2+ip+j)}{p^{p+1}}\right\}_{0 \leq k \leq p-1}$ forms a complete system of residues modulo p. This means that $\sum_{n_1=d-1}^{0}(-i)^{n_1} q_{p+1+n_1}(j) \equiv \sum_{n_2=p-1}^{0}(-i)^{n_2} q_{n_2}(j) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$. Since $1 \leq d \leq p$, due to the same reason given in the proof of Theorem 9, one has $q_0(j) \equiv \cdots \equiv q_{p+d}(j) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$. That is, $q_0(x), \cdots, q_{p+d}(x)$ are all null polynomials modulo p. Noticing that $q_{p+d}(x) = \mathcal{F}_p(x) q^*_{p+d+1}(x) + p q^*_{p+d}(x)$ and $q_n(x) = p q^*_n(x)$ when $0 \leq n \leq p+d-1$, one can prove this theorem. ■

Theorem 18 *Assume p is a prime and $p+2 \leq d \leq 2p+1$, then $\omega_1(p^d) = p(d-1)$.*

Proof: From the above theorem, choosing $q_d(x) = 1$, this theorem is thus proved. ■

4.3.4 The Case of $d = 2p + 2$

Apparently, the case of $d = 2p+2$ is an analog of the case of $d = p+1$. The following theorems can be easily obtained via the same way as above, so the proofs are omitted here.

Theorem 19 *Assume p is a prime and $1 \leq d \leq p$. A polynomial $f(x)$ is a null polynomial modulo p^{2p+2}, if and only if*

- $f(x) \equiv \sum_{n_1=p}^{0} p^{p-n_1}\mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(x)(\mathcal{F}_p(x))^{n_1} q_{p+1+n_1}(x) + \sum_{n_2=p}^{1} p^{2p+2-n_2}(\mathcal{F}_p(x))^{n_2} q^*_{n_2}(x) \pmod{p^{2p+2}}$;
- $q^*_1(x), \cdots, q^*_p(x)$ *are any polynomials of degree less than p modulo p^{2p+2};*
- $q_{2p+1}(x)$ *is any polynomial of any degree and $q_{p+1}(x), \cdots, q_{2p}(x)$ polynomials of degree less than p modulo p^{2p+2} that satisfy $\sum_{n_1=p-1}^{0}(-i)^{n_1} q_{p+1+n_1}(j) \equiv i q_{2p+1}(j) \pmod{p}$ for $i = \lfloor x/p \rfloor$ and $j = x \bmod p$.*

Theorem 20 *Assume p is a prime, then $\omega_1(p^{2p+2}) = 2p^2$.*

Corollary 12 *Assume p is a prime. If $f(x)$ is a least-degree monic null polynomial modulo p^{p+1}, then $(f(x))^2$ is a least-degree monic null polynomial modulo p^{2p+2}.*

Remark 4 *Specially, $(\mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(x))^2$ is a least-degree monic null polynomial modulo p^{2p+2}.*

4.3.5 The Case of $1 \leq d \leq p(p+1)$

Generalizing the above procedure until $d = p(p+1)$, one has the following theorems.

Definition 13 *Assume p is a prime. Define $A_{p,i,s,t}(x) = \sum_{n_i=s}^{t} p^{s-n_i}(\mathcal{F}_p(x))^{n_i} q_{i,n_i}(x)$.*

Theorem 21 *Assume p is a prime and $1 \le k \le p$. Then, $f(x)$ is a null polynomial modulo $p^{k(p+1)}$ if and only if*

$$f(x) \equiv (\mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(x))^{k-1} A_{p,k-1,p,0}(x) + \sum_{i=k-2}^{1} p^{(k-1-i)(p+1)} (\mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(x))^i A_{p,i,p-1,0}(x) \\ + p^{(k-1)(p+1)} A_{p,0,p-1,1}(x) \pmod{p^{k(p+1)}},$$

where all q-polynomials but the highest one in $A_{p,k-1,p,0}(x)$ is of degree less than p modulo $p^{d(p+1)}$, and the q-polynomials in $A_{p,k-1,p,0}(x)$ satisfy $\sum_{n_{k-1}=p-1}^{0} (-i)^{n_{k-1}} q_{k-1,n_{k-1}}(j) \equiv i q_{k-1,p}(j) \pmod{p}$ for $i = \lfloor x/p \rfloor$ and $j = x \bmod p$. Specially, $(\mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(x))^k$ is a least-degree monic null polynomial modulo $p^{k(p+1)}$.

Theorem 22 *Assume p is a prime, $k(p+1) < d < (k+1)(p+1)$ and $d_k = d - k(p+1)$, where $1 \le k \le p$. Then, $f(x)$ is a null polynomial modulo p^d if and only if,*

$$f(x) \equiv (\mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(x))^{k-1} A_{p,k-1,d_k,0}(x) + \sum_{i=k-2}^{1} p^{(k-1-i)(p+1)} (\mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(x))^i A_{p,i,p-1,0}(x) \\ + p^{(k-1)(p+1)} A_{p,0,p-1,1}(x) \pmod{p^{k(p+1)}},$$

where all q-polynomials but the highest one in $A_{p,k-1,p,0}(x)$ is of degree less than p modulo $p^{d(p+1)}$, and all the q-polynomials are null polynomials modulo p.

Theorem 23 *Assume p is a prime and $1 \le d \le p(p+1)$, then $\omega_1(p^d) = kp^2 + p(d - k(p+1)) = p(d-k)$, where $k = \left\lfloor \frac{d}{p+1} \right\rfloor$.*

The above theorems can be proved via a complicated induction on $k \ge 1$: from $d = (k-1)(p-1)$ to $(k-1)(p-1) < d < k(p-1)$ and then to $d = k(p-1)$, and finally to $k(p-1) < d < (k+1)(p-1)$. Since we will give a similar proof on the general case of $d \ge 1$ later, the proofs of the above theorems are omitted here.

4.3.6 The Case of $d = p(p+1) + 1$

Theorem 24 *Assume p is a prime. Then, $f(x)$ is a null polynomial modulo $p^{p(p+1)+1}$ if and only if*

$$f(x) \equiv (\mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(x))^p Q(x) + \sum_{i=p-1}^{1} p^{(k-1-i)(p+1)} (\mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(x))^i A_{p,i,p-1,0}(x) \\ + p^{(k-1)(p+1)} A_{p,0,p-1,1}(x) \pmod{p^{k(p+1)}},$$

where all q-polynomials are of degree less than p modulo $p^{d(p+1)}$, $Q(x) \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$, the q-polynomials in $A_{p,1,p,0}(x)$ satisfy $\sum_{n_1=p-1}^{0} (-i)^{n_1} q_{k-1,n_1}(j) \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ for $i = \lfloor x/p \rfloor$ and $j = x \bmod p$, and all other q-polynomials are null polynomials modulo p.

Theorem 25 *Assume p is a prime, then $\omega_1(p^{p(p+1)}) = \omega_1(p^{p(p+1)+1}) = p^3$.*

Definition 14 *Using the same way of defining $\mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(x)$, we have*

$$\mathcal{F}_{p,p(p+1)+1}(x) \equiv \prod_{i=0}^{p-1} \left(\mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(x) - ip^{p+1} \right) \equiv 0 \pmod{p^{p(p+1)+1}},$$

i.e.,

$$\frac{\mathcal{F}_{p,p(p+1)+1}(x)}{p^{p(p+1)}} = \prod_{i=0}^{p-1} \left(\frac{\mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(x)}{p^{p+1}} - i \right) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}.$$

Theorem 26 *Assume p is a prime. Then, $\mathcal{F}_{p,p(p+1)+1}(x)$ is a least-degree monic null polynomial modulo $p^{p(p+1)+1}$.*

Proof: The same as the proof of Theorem 15. ■

Lemma 25 *Assume* p *is a prime. Then,* $\forall i_1, i_2, j_1, j_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\lfloor\lfloor(i_1p^3+j_1)/p\rfloor(i_2p^2+j_2)/p\rfloor \equiv \lfloor\lfloor j_1/p\rfloor j_2/p\rfloor \pmod{p}$.

Proof: One has $\lfloor\lfloor(i_1p^3+j_1)/p\rfloor(i_2p^2+j_2)/p\rfloor = \lfloor\lfloor i_1p^2+j_1/p\rfloor(i_2p+j_2/p)\rfloor = \lfloor(i_1p^2+\lfloor j_1/p\rfloor)(i_2p+j_2/p)\rfloor = \lfloor i_1i_2p^3+i_1j_2p+i_2p\lfloor j_1/p\rfloor+\lfloor j_1/p\rfloor j_2/p\rfloor = i_1i_2p^3+i_1j_2p+i_2p\lfloor j_1/p\rfloor+\lfloor\lfloor j_1/p\rfloor j_2/p\rfloor \equiv \lfloor\lfloor j_1/p\rfloor j_2/p\rfloor \pmod{p}$. ■

Lemma 26 *Assume* p *is a prime. Then,* $\forall i_1, i_2, j_1, j_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\lfloor\lfloor\Lambda(i_1p^3+j_1)/p\rfloor\Lambda(i_2p^2+j_2)/p\rfloor \equiv \lfloor\lfloor\Lambda(j_1)/p\rfloor\Lambda(j_2)/p\rfloor$ $\pmod{p}$ *and* $\lfloor\Lambda(i_1p^2+j_1)/p\Lambda(i_2p^2+j_2)/p\rfloor \equiv \lfloor\Lambda(j_1)/p\Lambda(j_2)/p\rfloor \pmod{p}$.

Proof: This lemma can be proved in a similar to Lemma 22, based on the above lemma. ■

Theorem 27 *Assume* p *is a prime. Then,* $\forall i \in \mathbb{Z}$ *and* $\forall j_0, j_1, j_2 \in \{0, \cdots, p-1\}$, $\frac{\mathcal{F}_{p,p(p+1)+1}(ip^3+j_2p^2+j_1p+j_0)}{p^{p(p+1)+1}} \equiv -(i+\lfloor j_2\Lambda(j_{1,0})\Lambda(j_{2,1})/p\rfloor+\lfloor\lfloor j_1\Lambda(j_{1,0})/p\rfloor\Lambda(j_{2,1})/p\rfloor) \pmod{p}$*, where* $j_{1,0} = j_1p+j_0$ *and* $j_{2,1} = (j_2p+j_1)\Lambda(j_1p+j_0)$.

Proof: Assuming $x_0 = ip^3+j_2p^2+j_1p+j_0$, one has $\frac{\mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(x)}{p^{p+1}} = \frac{\mathcal{F}_p((ip^2+j_2p+j_1)\Lambda(x_0))}{p}$. Then, assuming $x_1 = (ip^2+j_2p+j_1)\Lambda(x_0)$, one has $\frac{\mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(x)}{p^{p+1}} = ((ip+j_2)\Lambda(x_0)+\lfloor j_1\Lambda(x_0)/p\rfloor)\Lambda(x_1) = x_2$. Next, $\frac{\mathcal{F}_{p,p(p+1)+1}(ip^3+j_2p^2+j_1p+j_0)}{p^{p(p+1)+1}} = (i\Lambda(x_0)\Lambda(x_1)+\lfloor j_2\Lambda(x_0)\Lambda(x_1)/p\rfloor+\lfloor\lfloor j_1\Lambda(x_0)/p\rfloor\Lambda(x_1)/p\rfloor)\,\Lambda(x_2)$. Then, from the above lemma, one has $\frac{\mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(x)}{p^{p+1}} \equiv -(i+\lfloor j_2\Lambda(x_0)\Lambda(x_1)/p\rfloor+\lfloor\lfloor j_1\Lambda(x_0)/p\rfloor\Lambda(x_1)/p\rfloor) \equiv -(i+\lfloor j_2\Lambda(j_{1,0})\Lambda(j_{2,1})/p\rfloor+\lfloor\lfloor j_1\Lambda(j_{1,0})/p\rfloor\Lambda(j_{2,1})/p\rfloor) \pmod{p}$. Thus this theorem is proved. ■

From the above theorem, one can easily derive the following corollaries.

Corollary 13 *Assume* p *is a prime. Then,* $\forall j \in \{0, \cdots, p^3-1\}$, $\left\{\frac{\mathcal{F}_{p,p(p+1)+1}(ip^3+j)}{p^{p(p+1)+1}}\right\}$ *forms a complete system of residues modulo* p *when* i *runs through a complete system of residues modulo* p.

Corollary 14 *Assume* p *is a prime. Then,* $\forall i \in \mathbb{Z}$ *and* $\forall j \in \{0, \cdots, p^4-1\}$, $\frac{\mathcal{F}_{p,p(p+1)+1}(ip^4+j)}{p^{p(p+1)+1}} \equiv \frac{\mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(j)}{p^{p+1}} \pmod{p}$, *i.e.,* $\frac{\mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(x)}{p^{p+1}}$ *forms a function modulo* p *of period* p^4.

Corollary 15 *Assume* p *is a prime. Then,* $\forall i \in \mathbb{Z}$ *and* $\forall j \in \{0, \cdots, p-1\}$, $\frac{\mathcal{F}_{p,p(p+1)+1}(ip^3+j)}{p^{p(p+1)+1}} \equiv -i \pmod{p}$.

Observing $\mathcal{F}_p(x)$, $\mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(x)$ and $\mathcal{F}_{p,p(p+1)+1}(x)$ and comparing their features, one can find a recursive formula to further generalize the above results to all values of d. This leads to an inductive proof of the general case of $d \geq 1$ given in next subsection.

4.4 The General Case: Null Polynomials modulo p^d ($d \geq 1$)

4.4.1 Some Definitions and Preliminaries

Definition 15 *Assume* p *is a prime and* $n \geq 0$*. Define an index-sequence as follows:*

$$I_p(n) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{when } n = 0, \\ pI_p(n-1)+1, & \text{when } n \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

When $n \geq 1$*, one can easily derive the close form of the above sequence:* $I_p(n) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} p^i = \frac{p^n-1}{p-1}$*. Specially,* $I_p(1) = 1$, $I_p(2) = p+1$, $I_p(3) = p(p+1)+1 = p^2+p+1$.

Definition 16 *Assume* p *is a prime and* $n \geq 0$*. Define a monic integer polynomial as follows:*

$$\mathcal{G}_{p,n}(x) = \begin{cases} x, & \text{when } n = 0 \\ \prod_{i=0}^{p-1}\left(\mathcal{G}_{p,n-1}(x) - ip^{I_p(n-1)}\right), & \text{when } n \geq 1, \end{cases}$$

where $I_p(n)$ *denotes the above index-sequence. Specially,* $\mathcal{G}_{p,1}(x) = \mathcal{F}_p(x)$, $\mathcal{G}_{p,2}(x) = \mathcal{F}_{p,p+1}(x) = \mathcal{F}_{p,I_p(2)}(x)$ *and* $\mathcal{G}_{p,3}(x) = \mathcal{F}_{p,p(p+1)+1}(x) = \mathcal{F}_{p,I_p(3)}(x)$.

An equivalent definition of the above polynomial is as follows.

Definition 17 *Assume p is a prime and $n \geq 0$. Define a rational polynomial*[6] $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,n}(x)$ *as follows:*

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,n}(x) = \begin{cases} x, & \text{when } n = 0 \\ \frac{\mathcal{F}_p\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,n-1}(x)\right)}{p} = \frac{\prod_{i=0}^{p-1}\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,n-1}(x)-i\right)}{p}, & \text{when } n \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

Then, define an integer polynomial by $\mathcal{G}_{p,n}(x) = p^{I_p(n)}\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,n}(x)$.

In the following, both $\mathcal{G}_{p,n}(x)$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,n}(x)$ will be frequently used to achieve a more concise description of the results on polynomials of this kind.

Theorem 28 *Assume p is a prime and $n \geq 1$. Then, $\forall x = ip^n + \sum_{k=n-1}^{0} j_i p^i$, where $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $j_0, \cdots, j_{n-1} \in \{0, \cdots, p-1\}$, it is true that $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,n}(x) = \frac{\mathcal{G}_{p,n}(x)}{p^{I_p(n)}} = i\left(\prod_{k=0}^{n-1}\Lambda\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,k}(x)\right) + A_n(x)p\right) + J_n(j_0, \cdots, j_{n-1})$.*

Proof: It is obvious that the result is true when $n = 1$. Let us use induction on n to prove the general case of $n \geq 2$, under the assumption that this theorem is true for any integer less than n.

From the hypothesis, $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,n-1}(x) = (ip+j_{n-1})\left(\prod_{k=0}^{n-2}\Lambda\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,k}(x)\right) + A_{n-1}(x)p\right) + J_{n-1}(j_0, \cdots, j_{n-2})$. Then, from the definition of $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,n}(x)$ and Theorem 7, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,n}(x) &= \frac{\mathcal{F}_p\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,n-1}(x)\right)}{p} = \left\lfloor \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,n-1}(x)/p \right\rfloor \Lambda\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,n-1}(x)\right) \\
&= \left\lfloor \left((ip+j_{n-1})\left(\prod_{k=0}^{n-2}\Lambda\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,k}(x)\right) + A_{n-1}(x)p\right) + J_{n-1}(j_0, \cdots, j_{n-2})\right) \Big/ p \right\rfloor \Lambda\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,n-1}(x)\right) \\
&= i\left(\prod_{k=0}^{n-1}\Lambda\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,k}(x)\right) + A_{n-1}\Lambda\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,n-1}(x)\right)p\right) \\
&\quad + \left(A_{n-1}j_{n-1} + \left\lfloor \left(j_{n-1}\prod_{k=0}^{n-2}\Lambda\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,k}(x)\right) + J_{n-1}(j_0, \cdots, j_{n-2})\right) \Big/ p \right\rfloor\right)\Lambda\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,n-1}(x)\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Applying the hypothesis on $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,k}(x)$, one has $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,k}(x) = (ip^{n-k}+\cdots+j_k)\left(\prod_{l=0}^{k-1}\Lambda\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,l}(x)\right) + A_k(x)p\right) + J_k(j_0, \cdots, j_{k-1})$. So, when $0 \leq k \leq n-2$, we can get $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,k}(x) = ip^2 D_k(x) + J_k^*(j_0, \cdots, j_{n-1})$ and then $\Lambda\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,k}(x)\right) = ip^2 D_k^*(x) + \Lambda(J_k^*(j_0, \cdots, j_{n-1}))$. Thus, moving all terms of p^2 and of high powers of p out of the floor function, one has

$$\left\lfloor \left(j_{n-1}\prod_{k=0}^{n-2}\Lambda\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,k}(x)\right) + J_{n-1}(j_0, \cdots, j_{n-2})\right) \Big/ p \right\rfloor = ipD^*(x) + J_n^*(j_0, \cdots, j_{n-1}).$$

Substituting the above equation into $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,n}(x)$, one immediately has

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,n}(x) &= i\left(\prod_{k=0}^{n-1}\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,k}(x)\right) + A_{n-1}\Lambda\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,n-1}(x)\right)p\right) \\
&\quad + \left(A_{n-1}j_{n-1} + ipD^*(x) + J_n^*(j_0, \cdots, j_{n-1})\right)\Lambda\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,n-1}(x)\right) \\
&= i\left(\prod_{k=0}^{n-1}\Lambda\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,k}(x)\right) + (A_{n-1} + D^*(x))\Lambda\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,n-1}(x)\right)p\right) \\
&\quad + \left(A_{n-1}j_{n-1} + J_n^*(j_0, \cdots, j_{n-1})\right)\Lambda\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,n-1}(x)\right).
\end{aligned}$$

---

[6] Like the name of "integer polynomial", a "rational polynomial" means a polynomial with rational coefficients.

Similarly, one has $\Lambda\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,n-1}(x)\right) = ipD_{n-1}^*(x) + \Lambda(J_{n-1}^*(j_0, \cdots, j_{n-1}))$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
g_n(x) &= i\left(\prod_{k=0}^{n-1}\Lambda\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,k}(x)\right) + (A_{n-1} + D^*(x))\Lambda\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,n-1}(x)\right)p\right) \\
&\quad + (A_{n-1}j_{n-1} + J_n^*(j_0, \cdots, j_{n-1}))\left(ipD_{n-1}^*(x) + \Lambda(J_{n-1}^*(j_0, \cdots, j_{n-1}))\right) \\
&= i\left(\prod_{k=0}^{n-1}\Lambda\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,k}(x)\right) + \left((A_{n-1} + D^*(x))\Lambda\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,n-1}(x)\right) + (A_{n-1}j_{n-1} + J_n^*(j_0, \cdots, j_{n-1}))D_{n-1}^*(x)\right)p\right) \\
&\quad + (A_{n-1}j_{n-1} + J_n^*(j_0, \cdots, j_{n-1}))\Lambda(J_{n-1}^*(j_0, \cdots, j_{n-1})).
\end{aligned}$$

Assigning $A_n(x) = ((A_{n-1} + D^*(x))\Lambda(g_{n-1}(x)) + (A_{n-1}j_{n-1} + J_n^*(j_0, \cdots, j_{n-1}))D_{n-1}^*(x))$ and $J_n(j_0, \cdots, j_{n-1}) = (A_{n-1}j_{n-1} + J_n^*(j_0, \cdots, j_{n-1}))\Lambda(J_{n-1}^*(j_0, \cdots, j_{n-1}))$, one immediately gets

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,n}(x) = i\left(\prod_{k=0}^{n-1}\Lambda\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,k}(x)\right) + A_n(x)p\right) + J_n(j_0, \cdots, j_{n-1}).$$

Thus, this theorem is proved. ■

The above theorem immediately derives the following corollaries.

Corollary 16 *Assume* p *is a prime and* $n \geq 1$*. Then,* $\forall i \in \mathbb{Z}$ *and* $j \in \{0, \cdots, p^n - 1\}$*, it is true that* $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,n}(ip^n + j) \equiv (-1)^n i + J_n(j) \pmod{p}$*.*

Corollary 17 *Assume* p *is a prime and* $n \geq 1$*. Then,* $\forall j \in \{0, \cdots, p^n - 1\}$*,* $\left\{\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,n}(ip^n + j)\right\}$ *forms a complete system of residues modulo* p *when* i *runs through a complete system of residues modulo* p*.*

Corollary 18 *Assume* p *is a prime and* $n \geq 1$*. Then,* $\forall i \in \mathbb{Z}$ *and* $\forall j \in \{0, \cdots, p^{n+1} - 1\}$*,* $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,n}(ip^{n+1} + j) \equiv \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,n}(j) \pmod{p}$*, i.e.,* $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,n}(x)$ *forms a periodic function modulo* p *of period* p^{n+1}*.*

Specially, when $j_1 = \cdots = j_{n-1} = 0$, we have a much simpler (but not so useful as one can see later) form of the above results.

Theorem 29 *Assume* p *is a prime and* $n \geq 1$*. Then,* $\forall x = ip^n + j$*, where* $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ *and* $j \in \{0, \cdots, p - 1\}$*, it is true that* $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,n}(x) = i\prod_{k=0}^{n-1}\Lambda\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,k}(x)\right)$*.*

Proof: Let us use induction on n to prove this lemma. When $n = 1$, one can easily get $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,1}(x) = \frac{\mathcal{F}_p(ip+j)}{p} = i\Lambda(x)$. Then, assuming this lemma is true for any integer less than n, let us prove the case of $n \geq 2$. From the definition of $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,n}(x)$, one has $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,n}(x) = \frac{\mathcal{F}_p\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,n-1}(ip^n+j)\right)}{p} = \frac{\mathcal{F}_p\left(ip\prod_{j=1}^{n-1}\Lambda(c_j)\right)}{p} = \left\lfloor ip\prod_{k=0}^{n-2}\Lambda\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,k}(x)\right)\Big/ p\right\rfloor \Lambda\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,n-1}(ip^n + j)\right) = i\prod_{k=0}^{n-1}\Lambda\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,k}(x)\right)$. Thus, this lemma is proved. ■

Corollary 19 *Assume* p *is a prime and* $n \geq 1$*. Then,* $\forall i \in \mathbb{Z}$ *and* $j \in \{0, \cdots, p - 1\}$*,* $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,n} \equiv (-1)^n i \pmod{p}$*.*

Lemma 27 *Assume* p *is a prime and* $n \geq 1$*. Then,* $\mathcal{G}_{p,n}(x)$ *is a monic null polynomial of degree* p^n *modulo* $p^{I_p(n)}$*, but not a null polynomial modulo* $p^{I_p(n)+1}$*.*

Proof: The second part of this lemma is a straightforward result of Corollary 19, since $\mathcal{G}_{p,n}(ip^n + j) \equiv (-1)^n ip^{I_p(n)} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p^{I_p(n)+1}}$ when $i \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$.

The first part of this lemma can be proved via induction on n. When $n = 1$, the result is obviously true. Let us consider the case of $n \geq 2$. Following the definition of $\mathcal{G}_{p,n}(x)$, one has $\frac{\mathcal{G}_{p,n}(x)}{p^{I_p(n)-1}} = \frac{\mathcal{G}_{p,n}(x)}{p^{pI_p(n-1)}} = \prod_{i=0}^{p-1}\left(\frac{\mathcal{G}_{p,n-1}(x)}{p^{I_p(n-1)}} - i\right)$. From the hypothesis, $\mathcal{G}_{p,n-1}(x)$ is a null polynomial modulo $p^{I_p(n-1)}$, so $\frac{\mathcal{G}_{p,n-1}(x)}{p^{I_p(n-1)}} \in \mathbb{Z}$ and then $\frac{\mathcal{G}_{p,n}(x)}{p^{I_p(n)-1}}$ is a null polynomial modulo p. This means $\mathcal{G}_{p,n}(x)$ is a null polynomial modulo $p^{I_p(n)}$. In addition, it is obvious that $\deg(\mathcal{G}_{p,n}, p^{I_p(n)}) = p \cdot \deg(\mathcal{G}_{p,n-1}, p^{I_p(n-1)}) = pp^{n-1} = p^n$. Thus this lemma is proved. ■

Corollary 20 *Assume* p *is a prime,* $e_1, \cdots, e_n \geq 1$ *and* $d = \sum_{i=1}^n e_i I(i)$. *Then,* $f(x) = \prod_{i=1}^n (\mathcal{G}_{p,i}(x))^{e_i}$ *is a monic null polynomial modulo* p^d*.*

Proof: This corollary can be easily derived from the above lemma. ■

Definition 18 *Assume* p *is a prime and* $d \geq 0$. *Define a polynomial sequence* $\{\mathcal{H}_{p,d}(x) = \prod_{i=1}^\infty (\mathcal{G}_{p,i}(x))^{e_{d,i}}\}_{d \geq 0}$, *where* $0 \leq e_{d,i} \leq p$, *in the following recursive way:*

$$\mathcal{H}_{p,d}(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & \textit{when } d = 0, \\ \mathcal{H}_{p,d-1}(x)\mathcal{G}_{p,1}(x), & \textit{when } d \geq 1 \textit{ and } \max_{i=1}^{\infty}(e_{d-1,i}) \leq p-1, \\ \dfrac{\mathcal{H}_{p,d-1}(x)\mathcal{G}_{p,i+1}(x)}{(\mathcal{G}_{p,i}(x))^p}, & \textit{when } d \geq 1 \textit{ and } \exists i \textit{ such that } e_{d-1,i} = p, e_{d-1,1} = \cdots = e_{d-1,i-1} = 0. \end{cases}$$

One can easily verify that in each polynomial defined in the above rule, there exists at most one exponent that satisfies $e_{d,i} = p$ *and all exponents after this exponent are zeros. Denote* $\max_{i=1}^\infty(e_{d,i})$*, i.e., the maximal exponent of* $\mathcal{H}_{p,d}(x)$*, by* $E_{\max}(\mathcal{H}_{p,d})$*.*

Apparently, $\mathcal{H}_{p,d}(x)$ is an analog of an integer represented with radix $p+1$, except that the last non-zero exponent of the former may be p. So we define a numeric representation of $\mathcal{H}_{p,d}(x)$ with floating radix.

Definition 19 *The numeric representation of a polynomial* $\mathcal{H}_{p,d}(x) = \prod_{i=1}^\infty (\mathcal{G}_{p,i}(x))^{e_{d,i}}$ *is an integer defined by*

$$\langle \mathcal{H}_{p,d} \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} e_{d,i} I_p(i) = (\cdots, e_{d,1})_{I_p},$$

where the subscript "I_p*" denotes the floating radix of* $\langle \mathcal{H}_{p,d} \rangle$ *as an integer. We call* $e_{d,i}$ *the i-th digit of the polynomial. If* $\langle \mathcal{H}_{p,d} \rangle = (e_{i_2}, \cdots, e_{i_1})_{I_p} = \sum_{i=i_1}^{i_2} e_{d,i} I_p(i)$*, where* $1 \leq i_1 \leq i_2$*, we say* i_2 *is the digit length and* e_{i_1}, e_{i_2} *are the LSD (least significant digit) and MSD (most significant digit) of the polynomial, respectively.*

Lemma 28 *Assume* p *is a prime and* $d \geq 1$*. Then,*

1. *when* $E_{\max}(\mathcal{H}_{p,d}) \leq p-1$, $\deg(\mathcal{H}_{p,d+1}, p) = \deg(\mathcal{H}_{p,d}, p) + p$*;*
2. *when* $E_{\max}(\mathcal{H}_{p,d}) = p$, $\deg(\mathcal{H}_{p,d+1}, p) = \deg(\mathcal{H}_{p,d}, p)$*.*

Proof: It is obvious that the digit length of $\mathcal{H}_{p,d}(x)$ is finite, since d is finite. Assume $\mathcal{H}_{p,d}(x) = \prod_{i=1}^n (\mathcal{G}_{p,i}(x))^{d_i}$. Then, consider two different cases. When $E_{\max}(\mathcal{H}_{p,d}) \leq p-1$, $\deg(\mathcal{H}_{p,d+1}, p) = \deg(\mathcal{H}_{p,d}, p) + p > \deg(\mathcal{H}_{p,d}, p)$. When $E_{\max}(\mathcal{H}_{p,d}) = p$, i.e., $\exists i$ such that $e_{d,i} = p$ and $e_{d,1} = \cdots = e_{d,i-1} = 0$, $\deg(\mathcal{H}_{p,d+1}, p) = \deg(\mathcal{H}_{p,d}, p)$ since $\deg(\mathcal{G}_{p,i+1}(x), p) = \deg((\mathcal{G}_{p,i}(x))^p, p) = pI(i)$. Thus this lemma is proved. ■

Lemma 29 *Assume* p *is a prime and* $d \geq 1$*. Then,* $\mathcal{H}_{p,d}(x)$ *is a monic null polynomial modulo* p^d*.*

Proof: Let us use induction on d to prove this lemma. When $n = 1$, it is obviously true. Assuming it is also true for any integer less than d, consider the case of $d \geq 2$.

When $E_{\max}(\mathcal{H}_{p,d}) \leq p-1$, one can see $\mathcal{H}_{p,d}(x) = \mathcal{H}_{p,d-1}(x)\mathcal{G}_{p,1}(x)$ is a null polynomial modulo $p^{d-1+1} = p^d$. When $E_{\max}(\mathcal{H}_{p,d}) = p$, i.e., $\exists i$ such that $e_{d-1,i} = p$ and $e_{d-1,1} = \cdots = e_{d-1,i-1} = 0$, $\frac{\mathcal{H}_{p,d-1}(x)}{(\mathcal{G}_{p,i}(x))^p}$ is a null polynomial modulo $p^{(d-1)-pI(i)}$ and $\mathcal{G}_{p,i+1}(x)$ is a null polynomial modulo $p^{I(i+1)} = p^{pI(i)+1}$. Thus, $\mathcal{H}_{p,d}(x) = \frac{\mathcal{H}_{p,d-1}(x)\mathcal{G}_{p,i+1}(x)}{(\mathcal{G}_{p,i}(x))^p}$ is a null polynomial modulo $p^{(d-1)-pI(i)+pI(i)+1} = p^d$ and this lemma is proved. ■

Theorem 30 *Assume* p *is a prime and* $d \geq 1$*. Then,* $\langle \mathcal{H}_{p,d} \rangle = d$*.*

Proof: This theorem can be proved in the same way as the above theorem. ■

4.4.2 Main Results

Theorem 31 *Assume p is a prime, $n \geq 1$. If $\sum_{\substack{0\le e_i\le p-1\\0\le i\le n}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{n} \left(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,i}(x)\right)^{e_i} q_{e_1,\cdots,e_n}(x)\right) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ holds for any integer $x \in \mathbb{Z}$, then $\forall e_1, \cdots, e_n \in \{0, \cdots, p-1\}$, $q_{e_1,\cdots,e_n}(x)$ is a null polynomial modulo p.*

Proof: Assuming $x = ip^n + \sum_{k=n-1}^{0} j_k p^k \in \mathbb{Z}$, where $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $j_0, \cdots, j_{n-1} \in \{0, \cdots, p-1\}$, let us prove this theorem via induction on n.

When $n = 1$, one has $x = ip + j_0$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,1}(x) \equiv -i \pmod{p}$, and then $\sum_{0\le e_1\le p-1} \left(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,1}(x)\right)^{e_1} q_{e_1}(x) \equiv \sum_{0\le e_1\le p-1} (-i)^{e_1} q_{e_1}(j_0) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$. Consider the polynomial $f(y) = \sum_{0\le e_1\le p-1} q_{e_1}(j_0) y^{e_1}$, one can see that $f(y) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ for any integer $y = -i \in \mathbb{Z}$. That is, $f(x)$ is a null polynomial modulo p. Since $\deg(f, p) < p$, one immediately derives that $q_{e_1}(j_0) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ for any integer $j_0 \in \{0, \cdots, p-1\}$. That is, $\forall e_1 \in \{0, \cdots, p-1\}$, $q_{e_1}(x)$ is a null polynomial modulo p.

When $n \geq 2$, assume this theorem is true for any integer less than n. From Corollary 18, $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,i}(x)$ forms a function modulo p of period p^{i+1}. So, assuming $x^* = x \bmod p^n = \sum_{k=n-1}^{0} j_k p^k$, one has

$$\sum_{\substack{0\le e_i\le p-1\\0\le i\le n}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{n} \left(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,i}(x)\right)^{e_i} q_{e_1,\cdots,e_n}(x)\right) \equiv \sum_{\substack{0\le e_i\le p-1\\0\le i\le n}} \left(\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,n}(x)\right)^{e_n} \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} \left(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,i}(x^*)\right)^{e_i} q_{e_1,\cdots,e_n}(x^*)\right) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}.$$

From Corollary 17, $\forall x^* \in \{0, \cdots, p^n - 1\}$, if i runs through a complete system of residues modulo p, then $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,n}(x)$ forms a complete system of residues modulo p. This means that the polynomial

$$f(y) = \sum_{e_n=0}^{p-1} \left(\sum_{\substack{0\le e_i\le p-1\\0\le i\le n-1}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} \left(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,i}(x^*)\right)^{e_i} q_{e_1,\cdots,e_n}(x^*)\right)\right) y^{e_n}$$

is congruent to 0 modulo p for any integer $y \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then, from $\deg(f, p) < p$, one immediately derives that

$$\sum_{\substack{0\le e_i\le p-1\\0\le i\le n-1}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} \left(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,i}(x^*)\right)^{e_i} q_{e_1,\cdots,e_n}(x^*)\right) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$$

holds for any integer $x^* \in \{0, \cdots, p^n - 1\}$ and $e_n \in \{0, \cdots, p-1\}$. Now the value of n is reduced to be $n-1$, so one can use the hypothesis for each $e_n \in \{0, \cdots, p-1\}$ to get the result: $\forall e_1, \cdots, e_n \in \{0, \cdots, p-1\}$, $q_{e_1,\cdots,e_n}(x)$ is a null polynomial modulo p. Thus, this theorem is proved. ■

Theorem 32 *Assume p is a prime and $d \geq 1$. Then, $\mathcal{H}_{p,d}(x)$ is a least-degree monic null polynomial modulo p^d.*

Proof: Let us prove this theorem via induction on d. The case of $d = 1$ has been proved above. Next, under the assumption that this lemma is true for any integer less than d, let us prove the case of $d \geq 2$. Consider the following two different cases.

Case 1: $E_{\max}(\mathcal{H}_{p,d-1}) < p$. Assume $f(x)$ is a null polynomial modulo p^d. Following Corollary 8, one has $f(x) \equiv \sum_{j=d-1}^{1} p^{d-1-j} \mathcal{H}_{p,j}(x) q_j(x) + p^{d-1} q_0(x) \pmod{p^d}$, where $q_j(x)$ is of degree less than p except $q_{d-1}(x)$ and $q_j(x) = 0$ if $E_{\max}(\mathcal{H}_{p,j}) = p$ (Lemma 28). In other words, each exponent of the effective polynomial $\mathcal{H}_{p,j}(x)$ satisfies $0 \leq e_{j,i} \leq p-1$. Then, from $f(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{p^d}$ holds for any integer x, dividing both sides by p^{d-1}, one has $\sum_{j=d-1}^{1} \frac{\mathcal{H}_{p,j}(x)}{p^j} q_j(x) + q_0(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$, where d_j is the sum of all exponents of $\mathcal{H}_{p,j}(x)$. So we know that $\sum_{\substack{0\le e_{j,k}\le p-1\\0\le k\le n}} \left(\prod_{k=1}^{n} \left(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{p,k}(x)\right)^{e_{j,k}} q_{e_1,\cdots,e_n}(x)\right) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ holds for any integer x, where n is the maximum of the digit lengths of $\langle \mathcal{H}_{p,j} \rangle$ for $j \in \{1, \cdots, d-1\}$. Then, from Theorem 31, one immediately gets $\forall e_{j,1}, \cdots, e_{j,n} \in \{0, \cdots, p-1\}$, $q_{e_1,\cdots,e_n}(x)$ is a null polynomial modulo p. That is, $\forall j \in \{1, \cdots, p-1\}$, $q_j(x)$ is a null polynomial modulo p. Then, choosing $p_{d-1}(x) = \mathcal{F}_p(x)$, one can get a least-degree monic null polynomial modulo p^d: $f(x) = \mathcal{H}_{p,d-1}(x)\mathcal{F}_p(x) = \mathcal{H}_{p,d}(x)$.

Case 2: $E_{\max}(\mathcal{H}_{p,d-1}) = p$. From Lemma 28 and $\omega_1(p^{d+1}) \geq \omega_1(p^d)$, one can see $\mathcal{H}_{p,d}(x)$ must be a least-degree monic null polynomial modulo p^d, since $\deg(\mathcal{H}_{p,d}, p) = \deg(\mathcal{H}_{p,d-1}, p)$.

Combining the above two cases, this theorem is thus proved. ■

Lemma 30 *Assume p is a prime and $d \geq 1$. Then, $\omega_1(p^{d+1}) - \omega_1(p^d) \in \{0, p\}$.*

Proof: It is a direct result of the above theorem and Lemma 28. ■

Corollary 21 *Assume p is a prime and $d \geq 1$. Then, $p \mid \omega_1(p^d)$.*

Proof: It is an obvious result of the above theorem. ■

Lemma 31 *Assume p is a prime and $n \geq 1$, then $\omega_1(p^{I_p(n)}) = p^n$.*

Proof: It is a direct result of Theorem 32 and Lemma 27. ■

Theorem 33 *Assume p is a prime and $d \geq 1$. If $\langle \mathcal{H}_{p,d} \rangle = (e_{d,n}, \cdots, e_{d,1})_{I_p}$, then $\omega_1(p^d) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} e_{d,i}p^i = p\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} e_{d,i}p^{i-1}\right)$.*

Proof: It is a straightforward result of the above lemma and the definition of $\mathcal{H}_{p,d}(x)$. ■

Algorithm 1 *From the above theorems and $d = \langle \mathcal{H}_{p,d} \rangle = \sum_{i=n}^{1} e_{d,i}I_p(i)$, one can derive an effective algorithm to determine all digits of $\langle \mathcal{H}_{p,d} \rangle = (e_{d,n}, \cdots, e_{d,1})_{I_p}$, and then determine $\mathcal{H}_{p,d}(x)$ and the value of $\omega_1(p^d)$ for any given $d \geq 1$. The algorithm can be described in the following steps.*

- *Step 1: find the integer $n \geq 0$ such that $I_p(n) \leq d < I_p(n+1)$ by calculating $n = \lceil \log_p(d(p-1)+1) \rceil - 1$;*
- *Step 2: assign $d^{(n)} = d$, and then for $i = n \sim 2$, calculate $e_{d,i} = \lfloor d^i / I_p(i) \rfloor$, $d^{(i-1)} = d^i - e_{d,i}I_p(i)$ and goto Step 3 if $d^{(i-1)} = 0$;*
- *Step 3: assign $e_{d,1} = d^{(i-1)}$;*
- *Step 4: output $\mathcal{H}_{p,d}(x) = \prod_{i=n}^{1} \left(\mathcal{G}_{p,i}(x)\right)^{e_{d,i}}$ and $\omega_1(p^d) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} e_{d,i}p^i$.*

One can see that the time complexity and the space complexity of the above algorithm are both

$$O(n) = O\left(\lceil \log_p(d(p-1)+1) \rceil - 1\right) = O(\log_p d).$$

Example 3 *Assume p is a prime and $i \geq 1$. Prove $\mathcal{H}_{p,p^i}(x) = \left(\mathcal{G}_{p,i}(x)\right)^{p-1} \mathcal{G}_{p,1}(x)$ and $\omega_1(p^{p^i}) = (p-1)p^i + p$.*

Solution: From $I_p(n) = \frac{p^n-1}{p-1}$, one immediately gets $n = i$. Assign $d^{(i)} = d$, one has $e_{d,i} = \lfloor d^{(i)}/I_p(i) \rfloor = \left\lfloor p^i \big/ \left(\frac{p^i-1}{p-1}\right) \right\rfloor = p-1$ and $d^{(i-1)} = d^{(i)} - e_{d,i}I(i) = 1$. Thus, $e_{d,2} = \cdots = e_{d,i-1} = 0$ and $e_{d,1} = 1$. So $\mathcal{H}_{p,p^i}(x) = \left(\mathcal{G}_{p,i}(x)\right)^{p-1} \mathcal{G}_{p,1}(x)$ and $\omega_1(p^{p^i}) = (p-1)p^i + p$. □

Figure 1 gives a partial list of $\mathcal{H}_{p,d}(x)$ from $d = 1$ till $d = I_p(4) + p$. In the list, the value of $\omega_1(p^d)$ increases by p except at the end of each row.

4.5 Enumerating All Null Polynomials modulo p^d ($d \geq 1$)

Based on the fact that $\mathcal{H}_{p,d}(x)$ is a least-degree monic null polynomial modulo p^d, one can enumerate all null polynomials of (less than) a given degree modulo p^d.

Theorem 34 *Assume p is a prime and $d \geq 1$. A polynomial $f(x)$ is a null polynomial modulo p^d if and only if $f(x) \equiv \sum_{j=d}^{1} p^{d-j}\mathcal{H}_{p,j}(x)q_j(x) \pmod{p^d}$, where*

- *$q_d(x)$ is an arbitrary polynomial of arbitrary degree modulo p;*
- *when $j < d$, $q_j(x) = 0$ if $E_{\max}(\mathcal{H}_{p,j}) = p$;*
- *all other polynomials are arbitrary polynomials of degree less than p modulo p.*

$$
\begin{array}{cccc}
 & \begin{array}{c} d=1 \\ \downarrow \end{array} & & \\
\text{N/A}^{*} & \mathcal{G}_{p,1}(x) & \cdots & (\mathcal{G}_{p,1}(x))^{p} \\
\hdashline
\mathcal{H}_{p,I_p(2)}(x)=\mathcal{G}_{p,2}(x) & \mathcal{G}_{p,2}(x)\mathcal{G}_{p,1}(x) & \cdots & \mathcal{G}_{p,2}(x)(\mathcal{G}_{p,1}(x))^{p} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
(\mathcal{G}_{p,2}(x))^{p-1} & (\mathcal{G}_{p,2}(x))^{p-1}\mathcal{G}_{p,1}(x) & \cdots & (\mathcal{G}_{p,2}(x))^{p-1}(\mathcal{G}_{p,1}(x))^{p} \\
(\mathcal{G}_{p,2}(x))^{p} & & & \\
\hdashline
\mathcal{H}_{p,I_p(3)}(x)=\mathcal{G}_{p,3}(x) & \mathcal{G}_{p,3}(x)\mathcal{G}_{p,1}(x) & \cdots & \mathcal{G}_{p,3}(x)(\mathcal{G}_{p,1}(x))^{p} \\
\mathcal{G}_{p,3}(x)\mathcal{G}_{p,2}(x) & \mathcal{G}_{p,3}(x)\mathcal{G}_{p,2}(x)\mathcal{G}_{p,1}(x) & \cdots & \mathcal{G}_{p,3}(x)\mathcal{G}_{p,2}(x)(\mathcal{G}_{p,1}(x))^{p} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
\mathcal{G}_{p,3}(x)(\mathcal{G}_{p,2}(x))^{p-1} & \mathcal{G}_{p,3}(x)(\mathcal{G}_{p,2}(x))^{p-1}\mathcal{G}_{p,1}(x) & \cdots & \mathcal{G}_{p,3}(x)(\mathcal{G}_{p,2}(x))^{p-1}(\mathcal{G}_{p,1}(x))^{p} \\
\mathcal{G}_{p,3}(x)(\mathcal{G}_{p,2}(x))^{p} & & & \\
(\mathcal{G}_{p,3}(x))^{2} & (\mathcal{G}_{p,3}(x))^{2}\mathcal{G}_{p,1}(x) & \cdots & (\mathcal{G}_{p,3}(x))^{2}(\mathcal{G}_{p,1}(x))^{p} \\
(\mathcal{G}_{p,3}(x))^{2}\mathcal{G}_{p,2}(x) & (\mathcal{G}_{p,3}(x))^{2}\mathcal{G}_{p,2}(x)\mathcal{G}_{p,1}(x) & \cdots & (\mathcal{G}_{p,3}(x))^{2}\mathcal{G}_{p,2}(x)(\mathcal{G}_{p,1}(x))^{p} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
(\mathcal{G}_{p,3}(x))^{p-1}(\mathcal{G}_{p,2}(x))^{p-1} & (\mathcal{G}_{p,3}(x))^{p-1}(\mathcal{G}_{p,2}(x))^{p-1}\mathcal{G}_{p,1}(x) & \cdots & (\mathcal{G}_{p,3}(x))^{p-1}(\mathcal{G}_{p,2}(x))^{p-1}(\mathcal{G}_{p,1}(x))^{p} \\
(\mathcal{G}_{p,3}(x))^{p-1}(\mathcal{G}_{p,2}(x))^{p} & & & \\
(\mathcal{G}_{p,3}(x))^{p} & & & \\
\hdashline
\mathcal{H}_{p,I_p(4)}(x)=\mathcal{G}_{p,4}(x) & \mathcal{G}_{p,4}(x)\mathcal{G}_{p,1}(x) & \cdots & \mathcal{G}_{p,4}(x)(x)(\mathcal{G}_{p,1}(x))^{p} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots
\end{array}
$$

* In fact, we can also generalize the result to $d = 0$. In this case, the modulus becomes $p^0 = 1$, so $\forall x \in \mathbb{Z}$, one has $x \equiv 0 \pmod 1$. Thus, $f(x) = \prod_{i=1}^{\infty}(\mathcal{G}_{p,i})^0 = 1$ is a least-degree monic null polynomial modulo 1. It is obvious that this case also obeys the above theorems. In this sense, we can replace "$d \geq 1$" in the above theorems by "$d \geq 0$".

Figure 1: An incomplete list of $\mathcal{H}_{p,d}(x)$, where d increases by 1 from left to right and from top to bottom, $\omega_1(p^d)$ does not change at the end of each row and increases by p elsewhere.

Explain: It can be easily derived from Theorem 32, following the theorems on null polynomials modulo p^d when $1 \leq d \leq p(p+1)+1$ (given in the previous subsection). □

The above theorem makes it possible to calculate the number of (monic) null polynomials of a given degree modulo p^d, which may be useful in some real applications. For example, through the following theorem, the number of (monic) null polynomials is actually the number of equivalent polynomials modulo m. This can be further used to estimate the number of distinct polynomial functions of some kind modulo m, once the number of candidate polynomials of this kind have been known.

Theorem 35 *Two polynomials, $f_1(x)$ and $f_2(x)$, are equivalent polynomials modulo m if and only if $f_1(x) - f_2(x)$ is a null polynomial modulo m.*

Proof: Obvious. ■

Definition 20 *In a complete system of polynomial residues modulo p^d, denote the number of null polynomials of degree n by $N_{np}(n, p^d)$ and the number of monic null polynomials of degree n by $N_{mnp}(n, p^d)$. Similarly, denote the number of null polynomials of degree $\leq n$ by $N_{np}(\leq n, p^d)$ and the number of monic null polynomials of degree $\leq n$ by $N_{mnp}(\leq n, p^d)$. Here, the subscript "np" means "null polynomials" and "mnp" denotes "monic null polynomials".*

It is obvious that $N_{np}(n, p^d) = N_{np}(\leq n, p^d) - N_{np}(\leq n-1, p^d)$ and $N_{mnp}(n, p^d) = N_{mnp}(\leq n, p^d) - N_{mnp}(\leq n-1, p^d)$. So, in the following we mainly focus on $N_{np}(\leq n, p^d)$ and $N_{mnp}(\leq n, p^d)$.

Theorem 36 *Assume p is a prime, $d \geq 1$ and $n < \omega_1(p^d)$, then $N_{mnp}(n, p^d) = N_{mnp}(\leq n, p^d) = 0$.*

Proof: It is a straightforward result of the definition of $\omega_1(p^d)$. ■

Theorem 37 *Assume* p *is a prime and* $d \geq 1$*, then* $N_{mnp}(\omega_1(p^d), p^d) = N_{mnp}(\leq \omega_1(p^d), p^d) = N_{np}(\leq \omega_1(p^d) - 1, p^d)$*.*

Proof: The first equality is obvious since $N_{mnp}(\leq \omega_1(p^d) - 1, p^d) = 0$. The second equality holds due to the following fact: from Theorem 34, $q_d(x) \equiv 1 \pmod{p^d}$ in a monic null polynomial of degree $\omega_1(p^d)$, while $q_d(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{p^d}$ in a null polynomial of degree $\leq \omega_1(p^d) - 1$ (all other coefficients are free in both cases). ■

Theorem 38 *Assume* p *is a prime,* $d \geq 1$ *and* $n = \omega_1(p^d) + n^*$*, where* $n^* \geq 0$*. Then, it is true that* $N_{mnp}(n, p^d) = p^{dn^*} N_{mnp}(\omega_1(p^d), p^d)$ *and* $N_{mnp}(\leq n, p^d) = \frac{p^{d(n^*+1)}-1}{p^d-1} N_{mnp}(\omega_1(p^d), p^d)$*.*

Proof: From Theorem 34, to get a monic null polynomial of degree n modulo p^d, the highest coefficient of $q_d(x)$ must be congruent to 1 modulo p^d and all other coefficients can be freely assigned. This means that $N_{mnp}(n, p^d) = p^{dn^*} N_{mnp}(\omega_1(p^d), p^d)$. Then, $N_{mnp}(\leq n, p^d) = \sum_{i=0}^{n^*} p^i N_{mnp}(\omega_1(p^d), p^d) = \frac{p^{d(n^*+1)}-1}{p^d-1} N_{mnp}(\omega_1(p^d), p^d)$. Thus this theorem is proved. ■

Theorem 39 *Assume* p *is a prime,* $d \geq 1$ *and* $n = \omega_1(p^d) + n^*$*, where* $n^* \geq 0$*, then* $N_{np}(\leq n, p^d) = p^d N_{mnp}(n, p^d) = \frac{p^{d(n^*+1)}(p^d-1)}{p^{d(n^*+1)}-1} N_{mnp}(\leq n, p^d)$*.*

Proof: From Theorem 34, to get a monic null polynomial $f(x)$ of degree n modulo p^d, $q_d(x)$ should be a monic polynomial of degree $n - \omega_1(p^d)$ modulo p^d; and to get a null polynomial $f(x)$ modulo p^d, $q_d(x)$ can be arbitrary polynomial of degree $\leq n - \omega_1(p^d)$ modulo p^d. In other words, for the former case, the highest coefficient a_n must be congruent to 1 modulo p^d, while for the latter case, a_n can be any value modulo p^d. Considering other $n-1$ coefficients can be freely assigned for both cases, one immediately gets $N_{np}(\leq n, p^d) = p^d N_{mnp}(n, p^d)$. In a similar way and from the above theorem, we can get $N_{np}(\leq n, p^d) = \frac{p^{d(n^*+1)}}{(p^{d(n^*+1)})/(p^d-1)} N_{mnp}(\leq n, p^d) = \frac{p^{d(n^*+1)}(p^d-1)}{p^{d(n^*+1)}-1} N_{mnp}(\leq n, p^d)$. Thus this theorem is proved. ■

Remark 5 *In the above theorems, note that when* p^d *is relatively large, we have* $N_{np}(\leq n, p^d) \approx p^d N_{mnp}(\leq n, p^d)$ *and* $N_{mnp}(\leq n, p^d) \approx N_{mnp}(n, p^d)$*. This means that* $N_{mnp}(n, p^d) \gg N_{mnp}(\leq n-1, p^d)$ *in this case.*

Theorem 40 *Assume* p *is a prime,* $d \geq 1$ *and* $n = \omega_1(p^d)) + n^*$*, where* $n^* \geq 0$*. Then,* $N_{np}(\leq n, p^d) = p^{d(n^*+1)} N_{np}(\leq \omega_1(p^d) - 1, p^d)$*.*

Proof: From Theorem 34, for each polynomial counted in $N_{np}(\leq \omega_1(p^d) - 1, p^d)$, there are $p^{d(n^*+1)}$ possibilities of $q_d(x)$ modulo p^d. ■

From the above theorem, one can only consider the value of $N_{np}(\leq n, p^d)$ when $1 \leq d \leq \omega_1(p^d) - 1$.

Theorem 41 *Assume* p *is a prime,* $d_1, d_2 \geq 1$ *and* $n < \min(\omega_1(p^{d_1}), \omega_1(p^{d_2}))$*. Then,* $N_{np}(\leq n, p^{d_1}) = N_{np}(\leq n, p^{d_2})$*.*

Proof: It is a straightforward result of Theorem 34, since $q_j(x)$ can be freely assigned any value modulo p^j for $j < \min(\omega_1(p^{d_1}), \omega_1(p^{d_2}))$. ■

Corollary 22 *Assume* p *is a prime,* $d \geq 1$ *and* $n < \omega_1(p^d)$*. If* $E_{\max}(\mathcal{H}_{p,d}) = p$*, then* $N_{np}(\leq n, p^d) = N_{np}(\leq n, p^{d+1})$*.*

Proof: It is result of the above theorem and the fact that $\omega_1(p^d) = \omega_1(p^{d+1})$. ■

Definition 21 *Assume* p *is a prime and* $n \geq 1$*. Define an integer sequence* $N_p(n)$ *as follows:*

$$N_p(n) = \begin{cases} 1, & \textit{when } n = 1, \\ \prod_{i=0}^{p-1} \left(p^{ip^{n-1} I_p(n-1)} N_p(n-1) \right) = p^{\frac{p^n \left(p^{n-1}-1\right)}{2}} (N(n-1))^p & \textit{when } n \geq 2. \end{cases}$$

Specially, $N_p(2) = p^{\frac{p^2(p-1)}{2}}$*,* $N_p(3) = p^{\frac{p^3(p^2+p-2)}{2}}$ *and* $N_p(4) = p^{\frac{p^4(p^3+p^2+p-3)}{2}}$*.*

The above sequence $N(n)$ has an alternative (actually equivalent) definition via addition (not product). In the following, we use both of the two definitions to achieve a more concise description of related results.

Definition 22 *Assume p is a prime and $n \geq 1$. Define an integer sequence $\widetilde{N}_p(n)$ as follows:*

$$\widetilde{N}_p(n) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{when } n = 1, \\ \sum_{i=0}^{p-1}\left(ip^{n-1}I_p(n-1) + \widetilde{N}_p(n-1)\right) = \frac{p^n\left(p^{n-1}-1\right)}{2} + p\widetilde{N}_p(n-1), & \text{when } n \geq 2. \end{cases}$$

Then, define $N(n)_p = p^{\widetilde{N}_p(n)}$. Specially, $\widetilde{N}_p(2) = \frac{p^2(p-1)}{2}$, $\widetilde{N}_p(3) = \frac{p^3(p^2+p-2)}{2}$ $\widetilde{N}_p(4) = \frac{p^4(p^3+p^2+p-3)}{2}$.

Theorem 42 *Assume p is a prime and $n \geq 1$, then $\widetilde{N}_p(n) = \frac{p^n\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} p^i - (n-1)\right)}{2} = \frac{p^n(I_p(n)-n)}{2} = \frac{p^n(p^n - np + (n-1))}{2(p-1)}$.*

Proof: From the definition, $\widetilde{N}_p(n) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1}\left(p^{n-1-i}\left(\frac{p^{i+1}(p^i-1)}{2}\right)\right) = \frac{p^n\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1}(p^i-1)\right)}{2} = \frac{p^n\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} p^i - (n-1)\right)}{2} = \frac{p^n}{2}\left(\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} p^i - n\right) = \frac{p^n(I_p(n)-n)}{2} = \frac{p^n}{2}\left(\frac{p^n-1}{p-1} - n\right) = \frac{p^n(p^n-np+(n-1))}{2(p-1)}$. Thus this theorem is proved. ■

Lemma 32 *Assume p is a prime and $n < p$, then $N_{np}(\leq n, p^d) = 1$.*

Proof: It is obvious, since $f(x) = 0$ is the only null polynomial of degree less than p. ■

Corollary 23 *Assume p is a prime, then $N_{np}(\leq \omega_1(p^{I_p(1)}) - 1, p^{I_p(1)}) = 1 = N_p(1)$.*

Proof: It is a straightforward result of the above lemma since $\omega_1(p^{I_p(1)}) - 1 = p - 1 < p$. ■

Lemma 33 *Assume p is a prime, $1 \leq d \leq p$ and $ip \leq n < (i+1)p$, where $i \in \{1, \cdots, d-1\}$. Then $N_{np}(\leq n, p^d) = p^{\frac{i(i-1)p}{2} + i(n-ip+1)}$. Specially, $N_{np}(\leq \omega_1(p^d) - 1, p^d) = p^{\frac{d(d-1)p}{2}}$ and $N_{np}(\leq \omega_1(p^p) - 1, p^p) = p^{\frac{p^2(p-1)}{2}} = N_p(2)$.*

Proof: From Theorem 34, when $ip \leq n < (i+1)p$, $q_1(x), \cdots, q_{i-1}(x)$ can be of degree $\leq p-1$ modulo p^d but $q_i(x)$ should be of degree $\leq n - ip$ modulo p^d. So, $N_{np}(\leq n, p^d) = \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} p^{jp} + p^{i(n-ip+1)} = p^{\frac{i(i-1)p}{2} + i(n-ip+1)}$. When $n = \omega_1(p^d) - 1 = pd - 1$, one has $N_{np}(\leq n, p^d) = p^{\frac{(d-1)(d-2)p}{2} + (d-1)((pd-1)-(d-1)p+1)} = p^{\frac{(d-1)(d-2)p}{2} + (d-1)p} = p^{\frac{d(d-1)p}{2}}$. Further, when $d = p$, one immediately has $N_{np}(\leq \omega_1(p^p) - 1, p^p) = p^{\frac{p^2(p-1)}{2}} = N_p(2)$. ■

Corollary 24 *Assume p is a prime, then $N_{np}(\leq \omega_1(p^{I_p(2)}) - 1, p^{I_p(2)}) = p^{\frac{p^2(p-1)}{2}} = N_p(2)$.*

Proof: It is a result of the above lemma and the fact that $\omega_1(p^{p+1}) = \omega_1(p^p)$. ■

Theorem 43 *Assume p is a prime and $n \geq 1$. Then, $N_{np}(\leq \omega_1(p^{I_p(n)}) - 1, p^{I_p(n)}) = N_p(n)$.*

Proof: Let us prove this theorem via induction on n. The case of $n = 1$ is obvious and the case of $n = 2$ has been proved above. Next, assume this theorem is true for any integer less than n, let us prove the case of $n \geq 3$.

From Theorem 34, $f(x) \equiv \sum_{j=d}^{1} p^{d-j}\mathcal{H}_{p,j}(x)q_j(x) \pmod{p^d}$. When $d = I_p(n)$, we can rewrite this congruence as follows: $f(x) \equiv \mathcal{G}_{p,n}(x)q_{I_p(n)}(x) + \sum_{\substack{0 \leq e_{d,i} \leq p-1 \\ 1 \leq i \leq n-1}} p^{d-j(e_{d,1},\cdots,e_{d,n-1})} \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} (\mathcal{G}_{p,i}(x))^{e_{d,i}} q_{j(e_{d,1},\cdots,e_{d,n-1})}(x) \pmod{p^d}$, where $j(e_{d,1}, \cdots, e_{d,n-1}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} e_{d,i}I(i)$. Let us divide all the q-polynomials, excluding $q_{I_p(n)}(x)$, into p parts, each of which corresponds to a distinct value of $e_{d,n-1} \in \{0, \cdots, p-1\}$:

$$(\mathcal{G}_{p,n-1}(x))^{e_{d,n-1}} \left(\sum_{\substack{0 \leq e_{d,i} \leq p-1 \\ 1 \leq i \leq n-2}} p^{d-j(e_{d,1},\cdots,e_{d,n-1})} \prod_{i=1}^{n-2} (\mathcal{G}_{p,i}(x))^{e_{d,i}} q_{j(e_{d,1},\cdots,e_{d,n-1})}(x) \right) \pmod{p^d}.$$

One can see that the number of all possibilities of this part is

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{\substack{0 \leq e_{d,i} \leq p-1 \\ 1 \leq i \leq n-2}} \left(p^{e_{d,n-1}I_p(n-1)} p^{j(e_{d,1},\cdots,e_{d,n-2})}\right)^p &= \left(p^{e_{d,n-1}pI_p(n-1)}\right)^{\omega_1\left(p^{I_p(n-2)}\right)} N_p(n-1) \\ &= p^{e_{d,n-1}p^{n-1}I_p(n-1)} N_p(n-1), \end{aligned}$$

where note that $\omega_1(p^{I_p(n-2)})$ denotes the number of factors in the left side. Finally, one immediately has

$$\begin{aligned} N_{np}(\leq \omega_1(p^{I_p(n)})-1, p^{I_p(n)}) &= \left(\prod_{e_{d,n-1}=0}^{p-1}\left(p^{e_{d,n-1}p^{n-1}I_p(n-1)}N_p(n-1)\right)\right) \\ &= p^{\frac{p^n(p^{n-1}-1)}{2}}(N_p(n-1))^p = N_p(n). \end{aligned}$$

Thus this theorem is proved. ■

Definition 23 *Assume* p *is a prime,* $n \geq 1$ *and* $0 \leq i \leq p$*. Define a two-index generalization of* $N_p(n)$ *as follows:*

$$N_p(n,i) = \prod_{j=0}^{i-1}\left(p^{jp^nI_p(n)}N_p(n)\right) = p^{\frac{i(i-1)p^nI_p(n)}{2}}(N_p(n))^i.$$

Specially, $N_p(n,0) = 1$*,* $N_p(n,1) = N_p(n)$ *and* $N_p(n,p) = N_p(n+1)$*.*

Definition 24 *Similarly, define a two-index generalization of* $\widetilde{N}_p(n)$ *by*

$$\widetilde{N}_p(n,i) = \sum_{j=0}^{i-1}\left(jp^nI_p(n) + \widetilde{N}_p(n)\right) = \frac{i(i-1)p^nI_p(n)}{2} + i\widetilde{N}_p(n) = \log_p\left(N_p(n,i)\right).$$

Specially, $\widetilde{N}_p(n,0) = 0$*,* $\widetilde{N}_p(n,1) = \widetilde{N}_p(n)$*, and* $\widetilde{N}_p(n,p) = \widetilde{N}_p(n+1)$*.*

Theorem 44 *Assume* p *is a prime,* $n \geq 1$ *and* $d = iI(n)$*, where* $1 \leq i \leq p$*. Then,* $N_{np}(\leq \omega_1(p^d)-1, p^d) = N_p(n,i)$*.*

Proof: Following the same idea used in the proof of the above theorem, one has $N_{np}(\leq \omega_1(p^d)-1, p^d) = \sum_{e_{d,n}=0}^{i-1}\left(p^{e_{d,n}p^nI_p(n)}N_p(n)\right) = p^{\frac{i(i-1)p^nI_p(n)(N_p(n))^i}{2}} = N_p(n,i)$. ■

Theorem 45 *Assume* p *is a prime and* $d \geq 1$*. If* $\langle \mathcal{H}_{p,d} \rangle = (e_{d,n}, \cdots, e_{d,1})_{I_p}$*, then* $N_{np}(\leq \omega_1(p^d)-1, p^d) = N_p(n, e_{d,n})\prod_{i=n-1}^{1} p^{d_i^*}N_p(i, e_{d,i})$*, where* $d_i^* = \sum_{j=n}^{i+1} e_{d,j}p^jI_p(j)$*.*

Proof: This theorem can be easily proved following the same idea used in the proofs of the above theorems. At first, we enumerate the number of q-polynomials before $(\mathcal{G}_{p,n}(x))^{e_{d,n}}$, which is $N_p(n, e_{d,n})$ from the above theorem. Then, we enumerate the q-polynomials occurring between $(\mathcal{G}_{p,n}(x))^{e_{d,n}}$ and $(\mathcal{G}_{p,n}(x))^{e_{d,n}}(\mathcal{G}_{p,n-1}(x))^{e_{d,n-1}}$, which is $p^{e_{d,n}p^nI_p(n)}N_p(n-1, e_{d,n-1})$. Note that when $e_{d,n-1} = 0$ this number is still valid, though this case is not covered by the above theorem. Repeat this procedure until all q-polynomials except $q_d(x)$ are enumerated, we immediately prove this theorem. ■

Remark 6 *When* $n < \omega_1(p^d) - 1$*, the value of* $N_{np}(\leq n, p^d)$ *can be calculated via an integer* d^* *such that* $\omega_1(d^*) - p \leq n < \omega_1(d^*)$*. Then, from Theorem 41,* $N_{np}(\leq \omega_1(d^*)-1, p^{d^*}) = N_{np}(\leq n, p^{d^*})p^{\bar{d}^*(\omega_1(p^{d^*})-1-n)} = N_{np}(\leq n, p^d)p^{\bar{d}^*(\omega_1(p^{d^*})-1-n)}$*, where* $\bar{d}^*$ *is the largest integer such that* $\omega_1(p^{\bar{d}^*}) = \omega_1(p^{d^*}) - 1$*. Thus,* $N_{np}(\leq n, p^d) = \frac{N_{np}(\leq \omega_1(d^*)-1, p^{d^*})}{p^{\bar{d}^*(\omega_1(p^{d^*})-1-n)}}$*.*

Appendix

After finishing the first draft of this paper, we noticed that the main result (Theorem 32) obtained in this paper has been covered in Kempner's papers on this subject [3,4] published in 1921. Kempner's proof is through a simple way that is totally different from that one employed in this paper. In addition, explicit formulas were not given to calculate $I_p(n)$ and $\omega_1(p^d)$ (though a method is qualitatively explained in §§1). Here, we give a brief introduction to Kempner's proof. Note that we use definitions given in this paper to achieve a simpler description of the results.

Definition 25 *Define* $\mu(m)$ *to be the smallest positive integer such that* $\mu(m)! \equiv 0 \pmod{m}$*.*

Lemma 34 (Lemma 1 in [3]) *The polynomial $f(x)=\prod_{i=0}^{\mu(m)-1}(x-i)$ is a null polynomial of degree $\mu(m)$ modulo m.*

Proof: When $0 \leq x \leq \mu(m)-1$, it is obvious $f(x)=0\equiv 0 \pmod{m}$. When $x \geq \mu(m)$, one has $f(x) = \mu(m)!\binom{x}{\mu(m)} \equiv \mu(m)! \equiv 0 \pmod{m}$, where note that $\binom{x}{\mu(m)}$ is an integer since $x \geq \mu(m)$. ■

Lemma 35 (Lemma 2 in [3]) *Any polynomial $f(x)=\sum_{k=0}^{n} c_k x^k$ is uniquely represented in the form $\sum_{k=0}^{n} a_k\binom{x}{k}$, and c_n, a_n are both different from zero if one of them is different from zero.*

Proof: Since x^k and $k!\binom{x}{k}$ are both monic polynomials of degree k, we can divide $f(x)$ by $\{x^k\}_{k=n}^{0}$ to get the first form and divide it by $k!\binom{x}{k}$ to get the second form. ■

Lemma 36 (Lemma 3 in [3]) *In the above lemma, if c_k ($k \in \{0,\cdots,n\}$) are integers, then $a_k/k!$ and therefore a_k, are integers.*

Proof: Comparing coefficients of the two forms of $f(x)$, this lemma is immediately proved. ■

Lemma 37 (Lemma 4 in [3]) *In the above lemma, if $f(x)$ is a null polynomial modulo m, then $a_k \equiv 0 \pmod{m}$ for $k \in \{0,\cdots,n\}$.*

Proof: A straightforward result of the above lemma. ■

Lemma 38 (Lemma 5 in [3]) *For a given modulus m, the integer polynomial $f(x)=\prod_{i=0}^{\mu(m)-1}(x-i)$ is a monic least-degree null polynomial modulo m, i.e., $\omega_1(m)=\mu(m)$.*

Proof: Assume $f(x)$ is a null polynomial modulo m. Then, from the above lemmas

$$f(x)=\sum_{k=0}^{n} ma_k\binom{x}{k} = ma_0+\sum_{k=1}^{n}\left(\frac{ma_k}{k!}\prod_{i=0}^{k-1}(x-i)\right),$$

where a_k are integers. To ensure $f(x)$ is a monic polynomial, $\frac{ma_n}{n!}=1$, so $m \mid n!$. From the definition of $\mu(m)$, we immediately have $n \geq \mu(m)$. Thus this lemma is proved. ■

The above proof gives a different (slightly simpler than us) least-degree monic null polynomial modulo m. In §§1 of [3], Kempner discussed how to calculate the value of $\mu(m)$ for different cases. When $m=p^d$ and $d \geq p$, he introduced an algorithm to calculate the value of $\mu(m)$, which is actually the same as the one given in Algorithm 1 of this paper.

In addition, based on the above null polynomial, Kempner developed a set of "completely reduced polynomials" modulo m and investigated related problems about such completely reduced polynomials. For more details, refer to Kempner's original work [3, 4].

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Prof. Carl Pomerance with the Department of Mathematics, Dartmouth College, Prof. Melvyn B. Nathanson with the Department of Mathematics, Lehman College, City University of New York, and Prof. Zhijie Chen with the Department of Mathematics, East China Normal University for some useful discussions. We also thank Mr. Chengqing Li for sending us a copy of [10] for reference.

References

[1] G. H. Hardy and E. M. Wright. *An Introduction to the Theory of Numbers.* The English Language Book Society and Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, E.L.B.S. 5th edition, 1981.

[2] Eric W. Weisstein. Integer polynomial. From MathWorld–A Wolfram Web Resource. `http://mathworld.wolfram.com/IntegerPolynomial.html`, 2005.

[3] Aubrey J. Kempner. Polynomials and their residue systems. *Trans. American Mathematical Society*, 22(2):240–266, 1921.

[4] Aubrey J. Kempner. Polynomials and their residue systems. *Trans. American Mathematical Society*, 22(3):267–288, 1921.

[5] Ivan Niven, Herbert S. Zuckerman, and Hugh L. Montgomery. *An Introduction to the Theory of Numbers*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, USA, 5th edition, 1991.

[6] Charles Vanden Eynden. *Elementary Number Theory*. McGraw-Hill, Inc., New York, USA, 1987.

[7] Kenneth H. Rosen. *Elementary Number Theory and Its Applications*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Reading, Massachusetts, USA, 3rd edition, 1993.

[8] H. E. Rose. *A Course in Number Theory*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, 2nd edition, 1994.

[9] Chengdong Pan and Chengbiao Pan. *Concise Number Theory*. Peking University Press, Beijing, China, 1998. (in Chinese).

[10] G. Mullen and H. Stevens. Permutation functions $\pmod m$. *Acta Mathematica Hungarica*, 44(3-4):237–241, 1984.

[11] Hans Lausch and Wilfried Nöbauer. *Algebra of Polynomials*. North-Holland/American Elsevier Publishing Company, Amsterdam (The Netherlands)/New York (USA), 1973.

[12] Ronald L. Rivest. Permutation polynomials modulo 2^w. *Finite Fields and Their Applications*, 7(2):287–292, 2001.

[13] Rudolf Lidl and Gary L. Mullen. When does a polynomial over a finite field permute the elements of the field? *American Mathematical Monthly*, 95(3):243–246, 1988.

[14] Rudolf Lidl and Gary L. Mullen. When does a polynomial over a finite field permute the elements of the field?, II. *American Mathematical Monthly*, 100(1):71–74, 1990.

[15] Gary L. Mullen. Permutation polynomials: A matrix analogue of Schur's conjecture and a survey of recent results. *Finite Fields and Their Applications*, 1(2):242–258, 1995.

[16] Rudolf Lidl and Harald Niederreiter. *Finite Fields*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, New York, USA, 2nd edition, 1997.

[17] Rudolf Lidl and Winfried B. Wüller. Permutation polynomials in RSA-cryptosystems. In David Chaum, editor, *Advances in Cryptology – Crypto'83*, pages 293–301, New York, 1983. Plenum Press.

[18] P. Delsarte, Yvo Desmedt, Andrew M. Odlyzko, and P. Piret. Fast cryptanalysis of the Matsumoto-Imai public key scheme. In T. Beth, N. Cot, and I. Ingemarsson, editors, *Advances in Cryptology – EuroCrypt'84*, volume 209 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 142–149, Berlin, 1985. Springer-Verlag.

[19] Gary L. Mullen. Permutation polynomials and nonsingular feedback shift registers over finite fields. *IEEE Trans. Information Technology*, 35(4):900–902, 1989.

[20] Yann Laigle-Chapuy. Permutation polynomials and applications to coding theory. accepted by *Finite Fields and its Applications*, in press, 2005.

[21] Rudolf Lidl, G. L. Mullen, and G. Turnwald. *Dickson Polynomials*. Longman Scientific & Technical, Harlow, Essex, UK, 1993.

[22] Fuzhen Zhang. *Matrix Theory: Basic Results and Techniques*. Spinger-Verlag New York Inc., New York, USA, 1999.